



# Ecumenicalism and Romanism

**Their Origin and Development**

*A New History of Dogma which Gives the Date of Origin  
of Roman Catholic Doctrines and Practices, as Found in  
the Writings of the Fathers and in the Texts of the Councils,  
Martyrologies, Rituals, Bulls, Hymns, Summas, Sermons and  
Biographies of the Middle Ages*

BY

**PETER J. DOESWYCK, D.D.**  
Author and Lecturer on Church History

Knights of Christ, Inc.  
P.O. Box 1651  
Long Beach, California

*Printed in the United States*

Copyright 1961  
by  
Peter J. Doeswyck

All rights reserved. No part of this book protected by the above copyright may be reproduced in any form without written permission of the publisher.

## ABOUT THE BOOK

The original manuscript of my *History of Dogma* contained over two hundred doctrines and customs of the medieval church. It would have required many volumes. The present manuscript has been condensed, abbreviated and revised so many times that it has finally turned into a brief, popular history of the principal doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. During the next three years (1962–1964) three volumes will be added.

## ABOUT THE TITLE

The word “Ecumenicalism” was carefully chosen and refers to a system of church government as it existed from 325 to 1054 A.D. Ecumenicalism lasted more than 700 years and has been dead for more than 900 years. There is, therefore, no need to coin a new word for this old idea.

The new word “Ecumenicity” means a quality of being world wide. Compare: simplicity, veracity, felicity, that is, a quality of being simple, honest and happy. This book does not deal with qualities, but with isms, theories, doctrines and systems. There is as much difference between Ecumenicalism and Ecumenicity as there is between liberalism and liberality; humanitarianism and humanity.

Ecumenicalism, in contrast to Episcopalism, Presbyterianism, Papalism or Romanism, refers to a church system wherein the highest and final authority is not vested in every individual pastor or Elder, in each diocesan bishop, or in one particular bishop of one particular town, but is vested in all bishops of the world collectively by allowing all bishops to attend the world councils and to discuss and vote on every matter of doctrine, policy and discipline.

—THE AUTHOR



## CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	5
---------------	---

### CHURCH

CHAPTER I. THE FIRST CHURCH .....	9
Did Christ found the Roman Church?	
CHAPTER II. GREGORY THE GREAT .....	16
Is it correct to call Gregory the Great a Roman Catholic pope?	
CHAPTER III. TRADITION .....	25
Is it not true that Tradition is as reli- able as the Bible or as any other his- torical document?	
CHAPTER IV. MEDIEVAL FORGERIES .....	31
Are you not mistaken when you say that Masses, Indulgences, Papacy, etc., are not mentioned by the Fathers of the Church?	

### BIBLE

CHAPTER V. BIBLE READING .....	40
Are Roman Catholics forbidden to read the Bible?	
CHAPTER VI. "BY FAITH ALONE" .....	46
Did Dr. Martin Luther falsify the text of the Bible in order to prove that sal- vation is "by faith alone"?	

CHAPTER VII.	APOCRYPHA .....	49
	Are the Apocrypha inspired and is the Protestant Bible incomplete?	
CHAPTER VIII.	BIBLE VERSUS ROME.....	55
	Are Roman teachings and practices contrary to the teachings of the Bible?	

## POPE

CHAPTER IX.	THE ANTICHRIST.....	57
	Is Rome the Antichrist?	
CHAPTER X.	THE ROMAN CHURCH .....	67
	What is the official name of the Church of Rome?	
	What is the meaning of the words "Church", "Catholicism", "Romanism", "Ecumenicalism", etc.?	
CHAPTER XI.	POPES AND PONTIFFS .....	71
	What is the origin and meaning of the words "Pope" and "Pontiff"?	
CHAPTER XII.	TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES .....	75
	When and how did the popes receive temporal powers?	
	When did the tiara and the custom of kissing the pope's feet originate?	
CHAPTER XIII.	"THE ROCK" .....	79
	Does the "Rock" ( <i>Matt. 16:18</i> ) refer to Christ, or to Peter and the Pope?	

CHAPTER XIV.	PAPAL SUPREMACY .....	89
	Is the primacy of the bishop of Rome an ancient doctrine?	
CHAPTER XV.	PAPAL INFALLIBILITY .....	99
	Was the infallibility of the pope an accepted doctrine of the early Church?	
CHAPTER XVI.	COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH .....	105
	What are the Commandments of the Church?	
CHAPTER XVII.	CANONIZATION OF SAINTS ..	109
	Did the early Church canonize Saints?	
CLERGY		
CHAPTER XVIII.	CLERICAL CELIBACY .....	117
	When was clerical celibacy introduced at Rome?	
ECUMENICALISM		
CHAPTER XIX.	THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH .....	138
	What is the difference between Greek Orthodox and Roman Catholic doctrines?	
	Who are the Uniats?	
CHAPTER XX.	ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT ...	142
	What is the new Ecumenical Movement?	
INDEX .....		148
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....		155

## CHAPTER ONE

### THE FIRST CHURCH

#### *DID CHRIST FOUND THE ROMAN CHURCH?*

The Church of Rome was founded by the disciples of Paul in the year 54 A.D., twenty-one years after the death of Jesus. Christ is not the founder of the Roman Church, the Greek Church, the African Church, nor of any other national church. The national churches were founded by the Apostles (*Matt. 28:19; Acts 8:1; Acts 13:1; 1 Cor. 1:2; Gal. 1:2; etc.*).

Christ Himself never was in Europe, much less in Italy. He founded "the" Church (Ekklesia), mentioned 115 times in the Bible (*Eph. 5:23; 5:25; etc.*). The adjectives "Roman" and "Catholic" cannot be found in the text of the N.T. Scriptures. The Church of Christ was founded in Jerusalem in the year 33 A.D. (*Acts 8:1*). The Bible does not mention the Church of Rome, nor the "Roman Church" (founded in 54), nor the "Catholic Church" (founded in 325), nor the "Roman Catholic Church" (founded in 1054). Neither does the Bible speak of a "pope" or "papacy" (the controversy of the last 9 centuries), nor does it mention a hierarchy, cardinals, monsignors, seven sacraments, Mass, transubstantiation, penance, extreme unction, purgatory, indulgences,

celibacy of the clergy, abstinence from meat on Fridays, Immaculate Conception of Mary, the Assumption of Mary into heaven, Hail Marys, rosaries, scapulars, medals, holy water, novenas, stations of the cross, or other Roman inventions.

Neither does the Bible speak of a 'Catholic priest' who is to bring sacrifices for sin, but it explains that in the N.T. there are no more sacrifices for sin (*Heb. 10:26*), that Christ is the only sacrificial priest and mediator of the New Testament, and that by this one, non-repeatable sacrifice on Calvary He saved us "to the uttermost", "once for all", "for ever" (*Heb. 4:14; 7:24; 7:27; 8:6; 9:15; 9:25-26; 9:28; 10:10; etc.*). Hence, we do not read in the Bible about 'Peter the Priest', 'Paul the Priest', 'Father James', 'Father Matthew', 'Monsignor Barnabas', 'Cardinal Andrew', 'Pope Simon', etc., because Christ alone is the "Highpriest" (*Heb. 5:5*), "the mediator of the New Testament" (*Heb. 9:15*) and "the head of the Church" (*Eph. 5:25*).

The Church of Jerusalem is the oldest of all churches (*Acts 2:41; 8:1*). It had been foretold that the Church would be founded "in Zion" (*Isa. 28:16; I Peter 2:6; Rom. 9:33; Acts 4:11*). Zion is Jerusalem, not Rome. Jerusalem is in Asia, not in Europe. European people like to think that Christianity started in Europe. The Bible says it started in the East and from there it gradually spread to the West. Christ insisted that His Church should begin "at Jerusalem" (*Luke 24:47*), and He instructed his disciples to preach the Gospel first "in Jerusalem and throughout Judaea" (*Acts 1:8*). Christ never mentioned "Italy". The Gospel was preached "to the Jews first" (*Rom. 1:16*) and a generation later "at Rome". The Holy Spirit descended upon the Church at Jerusalem (*Acts 1:4; 2:2*). The first bishop of the first and the oldest church was "James, the brother of the Lord", according to the unanimous testimony of both the Fathers of the church

and of the oldest church historians and the latest rituals (*Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., bk 2, chapt. 1; Migne, P.G. 20, 135; 20, 682; Breviary, May 1*). The contemporary Jewish historian, Flavius Josephus, places James, "the brother of Jesus", in authority at Jerusalem (*Josephus, Antiquities, bk 20, chapt. 9:1*). The Bible places James in authority at Jerusalem during the first 'council' of the church (49 A.D.). After the apostles had presented their cases, James wielded the gavel for silence (*Acts 15:13*), summarized the opinions expressed, pronounced his sentence (*Acts 15:19*), formulated them into canons (*Acts 15, 23-29*) and "the whole church" (*omnis ecclesia*) was pleased with the decision of James (*Acts 15:22*).

Msgr. Duchesne, the greatest Roman Catholic church historian, admits that Jerusalem was "the cradle of christianity", "the mother church", and that James was "the head of the Judaizing Church" (*Duchesne, Early history, vol. 1, p. 21-25; see C.E. 8, 355*). According to early tradition, all apostles stayed together in Palestine for at least nine years before they dispersed to "all nations" (33-42 A.D.). The same sources relate that Christ Himself had left the church to James, that Peter never contended for the bishopric, but worked under James in the diocese of Jerusalem (*Migne, P.G. 20, 135; Acts 8:14; Gal. 2:9*). For at least nine years there was only one church on earth: the Church of Jerusalem. For at least nine years there was only one bishop on earth: Bishop James. This fact alone refutes the later legends (the Clementine forgeries) that Christ founded the Roman Church and that He made Peter the first bishop of His church. When the early church spoke of "the" apostle it meant Paul, not Peter; and when it spoke of "the" bishop it meant James (*Migne, P.G. 1, 1070*).

During the first half of the first century there were no Christians in Rome. Rome had a pope ("papa") and a Supreme Pontiff ("pontifex maximus"), but both were pagans.

How then could the apostles have taught that there is no salvation unless one is subject to "the Roman Pontiff"? James had been a bishop for twenty-one years before Rome received the Gospel (54 A.D.). Bishop James died a martyr in 62 A.D. and was succeeded by his brother, Simeon, who lived till 110 A.D. Hence during the entire first century the bishopric was in the hands of the brothers of Jesus (*Duchesne, Early Hist., vol. 1, p. 63*).

The Bible mentions sixteen churches by name, but not one of them was subject to Rome. In the widest and wildest sense of the word no biblical church during the first thousand years can be called Roman Catholic.

Foot notes of the Roman Catholic Bible indicate that the Church of Jerusalem was founded in 33 A.D. and the Church of Antioch in 42 A.D. (*Acts 11:26*). Msgr. Duchesne holds that the Roman Church could not have been founded earlier than 51 A.D. and not later than 57 A.D. (*Duchesne, Early Hist. I, 41*). Hence, Peter could not have been Pope of Rome during the first half of the first century. We may here also remark that Roman theologians hold that the Gospel of Matthew was written before the dispersion of the Apostles (42 A.D.). Thus, besides the O.T. Bible, the Gospel existed in written form twelve years before the founding of the Roman Church.

The Liber Pontificalis (*vol. 1, p. 3*), Pope Leo the Great and Pope Gregory the Great (*Migne, P.L. 54, 425; 77, 899*), the Roman Council of 494 A.D. (*Migne, P.L. 59, 159*), the Roman Missal (*Feb. 22*), the Roman Breviary (*Feb. 1*), and other Roman documents (*Migne, P.L. 147, 642*) hold that Peter was Bishop of Antioch "for seven years", i.e., from 42 to 49 A.D. In the early church bishops were not transferred from one city to another. Therefore, Peter must have died as Bishop of the Syrian Church in 49 A.D. After that date he is never mentioned again in the N.T. Scriptures (*Acts 15:7*).

Christ told Paul to go to Rome (*Acts 23:11*). Paul sent twenty-seven missionaries of Corinth — everyone a convert of Paul — to Rome to prepare his coming (*Rom. 16*). Hence, the Church of Corinth (the East) founded the Church of Rome (the West); or, the Greek Church founded what three centuries later would become the Latin Church. In 58 A.D. Paul wrote to “all” that are in Rome and greets all the Roman clergy by name, but Peter is not among them (*Rom. 1:7; 16:1*). Paul himself arrived in Rome in 61 A.D. (*Acts 28:14-16*) and rented a parsonage for two years (*Acts 28:30*). If Peter had been pope, Paul would have stayed with him. While in Rome, Paul wrote to Timothy for more clergy, because there were none in Rome. When the Bible says that Paul and Luke were the only clergy in Rome (*II Tim. 4:11*), a Bible Christian may not believe that Peter was in Rome. According to tradition Paul died a martyr in 67 A.D. while founding the Roman Church.

The early Church of Rome says nothing about Peter and only recognizes Paul as the founder of the Western Church (*Migne, P.G. 1, 219; Mansi 1, 176*). In the second century, after the Church of Jerusalem had been 100% destroyed by Emperor Adrian in 135 A.D., and after Emperor Antonius (150 A.D.) had granted some freedom of religion to the Christians of Rome (Justin Martyr), the leaders of the Roman Church began to fabricate the most fantastic legends about Peter in Rome. The so-called “Clementine literature” of the 2nd and 3rd centuries are fully admitted forgeries (*Migne P.G. 1 & 2*). No authentic writing of the first two centuries places Peter in Rome. The later Fathers of the Church place Peter in Rome because they were the innocent victims of the Clementine forgeries.

“Jerusalem, which at this period is still the heart of Christianity” was erased from the earth in the 2nd century, and “Christianity lost its primitive centre, just at the moment



when the Church of Rome was ripe for the succession" (*Msgr. Duchesne, Early Hist., vol. 1, p. 38 & 48*). This does not mean the end of the Palestinian Church, nor the beginning of the Roman papacy. For one thousand years all Christians of the West called Jerusalem the "Holy City", and when the Church of Jerusalem was rebuilt it was called "the mother of all churches" (*Ecumenical Council of 381; Migne, P.G. 82, 1218*).

The first Roman clergyman, known by name, is Clement (c. 100), a Greek speaking presbyter who most likely came from the Church of Corinth. Notwithstanding the falsified texts of the Fathers, the Christians of the first thousand years believed that Clement had been the first Roman presbyter (*Migne, P.L. 23, 663; Monumenta Germ. Hist., Script., vol. 13, p. 75*). For that reason all early forgeries were attributed to Clement in order to make them of apostolic origin. From these Clementine forgeries it is still evident that Clement of Rome considered the Bishop of Jerusalem of higher rank, because he addressed him: "Lord James, the Bishop of bishops, ruling the Holy Church of the Hebrews at Jerusalem" (*Migne, P.L. 130, 19*). In the early prayers of the church Bishop James is mentioned before Clement (*Mansi I, 538 & 548*). After the year 1054 A.D. Rome was made the "Holy City" and the "Mother Church", and with a stroke of the pen Clement was made the "fourth" pope.

Rome had no Christian community till 54 A.D., no bishop till 150 A.D., no church building till the 4th century when Emperor Constantine embraced christianity and with the aid of the Spanish bishop, Hosius, founded the Ecumenical or Catholic Church (325 A.D.) with headquarters in Constantinople. As long as the Ecumenical Church existed (325-1054 A.D.) the Emperor himself held the title of Supreme Pontiff and the Church was governed democratically by an international council which functioned very much like the United Nations of today. There is not one authentic docu-

ment dating from the first thousand years of christianity which makes mention of an alleged papacy of the Universal Church. During the first thousand years not one bishop of Rome ever claimed to be the head of the church, not one ecumenical council was held in Rome, convoked by the bishop of Rome, or presided over by a pope. Ecumenicalism and Papalism, like democracy and totalitarianism, are opposites. After the final schism (1054) the Catholic Church split into two parts: East and West, and neither half could claim to be the whole church. The East began to call itself the Greek Orthodox Church and the West called itself the "Roman Catholic Church" ("Romana Universalis Ecclesia"), a name first used in the year 1059 (*Monumenta Germ. Hist., Leges, Sect. 4, vol. 1, p. 539*). The East remained democratic, the West became totalitarian. By forgeries, fraud, intrigue, assassinations, wars, and excommunications the popes subjected the rulers of the West one by one, and gained political control over all of Western Europe. The Papacy soon fell into the hands of politicians and it became so corrupt that it began to sell salvation for a price. It introduced seven sacraments and began to sell them. It began to sell Masses and Indulgences, and it corrupted christianity to such an extent that the West needed a Reformation. The Reformers (16th cent.) restored the teachings of the Bible, but divided the West into Romanism and Protestantism, while the East remained Greek Orthodox.

## CHAPTER TWO

### GREGORY THE GREAT

#### *IS IT CORRECT TO CALL GREGORY THE GREAT A ROMAN CATHOLIC POPE?*

Those authors who call Gregory I (d. 604) the last of the Fathers, the first Pope, a saintly scholar, and one who made purgatory a dogma of faith, are totally unqualified writers who fail to quote medieval sources, nor do they know the language in which these sources are written. In the days of Gregory there was no papacy, no Roman Catholicism, nor were there Roman dogmas. Christian doctrines were defined by the councils of the Ecumenical Church of which Rome was a member. The Roman Church had no more authority nor any more votes than any other national church at the Ecumenical Councils.

In order to discuss the origin of the papacy, we must first define it. The word "papacy" refers to the late Roman doctrine that one man, the bishop of Rome, is the head and totalitarian ruler of all christianity. In fact, such a papacy has never existed. Rome was subject to the Eastern Councils for one thousand years, but the East was never subject to the later Roman Councils. In practice, the papacy is an 11th-

century Roman invention which in vain claims jurisdiction over the East, and which rules only the Western Church (excluding Protestants). The fact that the early bishops of Rome were called "Pope" (papa) has nothing to do with the modern doctrine of the papacy, because all early bishops of Latin churches were called "pope". The third-century Church of Rome, for example, addressed St. Cyprian of Africa as "Pope Cyprian" (*Migne, P.L. 4, 275; 4, 311; Mansi 1, 801*). The word pope is older than the doctrine of the papacy. The Roman Catholic Papacy originated after the Schism of East and West (1054 A.D.).

The word "papacy" implies that all of Eastern Europe and Asia is schismatic and outside the pale of the true church. Such views were unknown in the days of Gregory the Great. A papacy supposes that Rome is the capital of Christianity with large offices for world administration. There were none in the days of Gregory. A papacy could hardly have existed without someone writing a book on it, or a treatise on the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome, or a biblical commentary on Matthew 16:18, explaining that the "Rock" refers to the Bishop of Rome. There were no such books written before the 11th century (*Migne, P.L. 161, 321; 217, 778*). There were no papal "Bulls" until Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand) in 1075 demanded that henceforth he alone should be addressed as "Pope" and "Pontiff" and wrote the Bull "Dictatus Papae", addressed to the whole church and assuming universal jurisdiction (*Migne, P.L. 149, 485*). Prior to the 11th century none of the bishops of Rome wrote a papal Bull in Greek, binding to the entire East. Gregory the Great did not know Greek and was not even qualified to preach the Gospel.

All scholars know that if anyone would have asked Gregory I: who is the Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church, he would have answered: the Emperor of the East. The Eastern

emperors held the title of Supreme Pontiff with the right to appoint bishops and to convoke ecumenical councils till the final Schism of 1054 A.D. If Gregory the Great had dared to say that he was the head of the entire church, the Ecumenical Councils would have excommunicated him and forced his resignation. Pope Vigilius (d. 555), for example, wrote a treatise for home consumption, but the Fifth Ecumenical Council (553 A.D.) immediately forced this Roman bishop to retract his heretical views, and his successor, Pope Pelagius, officially approved this Eastern decision (*Migne, P.L.* 69, 143; *Mansi* 9, 418). Pope Agatho (680 A.D.) taught that Emperor Augustus, as Supreme Pontiff of the Catholic Church, was far better qualified to interpret the Scriptures than the Bishop of Rome: "Your Highness is incomparably more able to penetrate the meaning of the Sacred Scriptures than Our Lowliness" (*Migne, P.L.* 87, 1175). While the popes in the days of Gregory crawled on their knees before the Eastern emperors, modern popes condemn private interpretation. The Sixth Ecumenical Council (680 A.D.) condemned Pope Honorius (d. 640) posthumously: "To Honorius, the heretic, anathema" (*Mansi* 11, 635). The same Eastern Council informed the then living bishop of Rome that his predecessor had been officially anathematized by the Catholic Church: as a heretic, as a sinner, and "as one fallen away from the faith" (*Migne, P.L.* 87, 1247). When we know that the Fourth Ecumenical Council (Chalcedon, 451) had ruled that the bishops of Constantinople and Rome were equals, enjoying the "same" ecclesiastical honors (*canon* 28; *Mansi* 6, 1229), that Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) fully approved the canons of this council (*Migne, P.L.* 54, 1038 & 1143), that this "Holy, Great and Universal Council" simply addressed the bishop of Rome as "Archbishop Leo" (*Migne, P.L.* 54, 951), that before the Schism all bishops of Rome taught that the ecumenical councils were above any in-

dividual bishop, it is unscholarly to speak of a "papacy" or even of the "rise of the papacy" in the days of Gregory the Great.

Pope Leo IX is the pope of the final Schism (1054) and was the first pope to assume the title of the "Vicar of the Son of God" (*Vicarius filii Dei*), the Roman numerals of which total "666" (*Rev. 13:18*). Leo first falsified the text of the old forgery, the Donation of Constantine, by inserting this title, and then he quoted his own forgery to the Patriarch of Constantinople as proof that he was the chief bishop on earth (*Migne, P.L. 130, 248; 143, 753; Mansi 2, 607; Labbe 1, 1534; C.E. 5, 118*).

The Roman bishops of the 11th century began to wear tiaras to indicate their new authority; they began to collect Peterspence and papal taxes from the entire West; they began to grant papal indulgences (never granted by the Ecumenical Church); they began to issue papal Bulls; create papal courts, etc., etc. This is the beginning or "the rise of the papacy", slowly developing out of the split of the old Ecumenical Church. Rome did not obtain its papal rights of Investiture (appointment of Western bishops) till the 12th century; it fought for five centuries to abolish the canonization rights of the Western bishops and to establish its sole, papal rights of canonization of saints (12th to 17th cent.); it established its papal power in the West by pure force and papal Inquisitions (12th and 13th cent.); it took Rome four centuries to force its Canon laws on the entire West (12th to 16th cent.); it was not till the 16th century that Rome succeeded in abolishing the national rites and rituals of the West and forced its own Roman Ritual on other churches; it was not till the end of the 19th century that the papacy was able to force under furious protest its alleged infallibility on the bishops of the West.

The early Roman councils were local councils, not binding

to other national churches. The early Roman rituals were local rituals, not used anywhere else. When the 8th and 9th century British rituals prescribe "prayers for the Pontiff" they do not refer to the modern "missa pro papa", but to a prayer for the independent British Primate (*Migne, P.L.* 89, 381).

If Gregory the Great was a pope in 590 A.D., of what was he a pope? Great Britain was 100% pagan. The Western Germanic tribes, the Bavarians, the Frisians, the Hollanders, the Saxons, etc., were not converted till the 8th century; the Norwegian, Swedish and Danish tribes received the Gospel for the first time in the 9th century; Poland and Hungary received the Gospel in the 10th century; Prussia in the 11th and 12th century; Estonia in the 13th century. Only Italy, France and Spain were 'christian', but 90% Arian (Unitarian). The Trinitarian or Catholic Church was in the East where Gregory had no more jurisdiction than a church mouse.

In the beginning of the 5th century the Goths invaded Italy, Gaul and Spain. They succeeded in establishing Arianism nearly everywhere. Since the last Western Emperor (476), the Italian kings were Arian, not Catholic. To please the Eastern Emperor, these Arian Rulers appointed Greek Catholics to the bishopric of Rome (Pope John I, II; 525, 535 A.D.). After 18 years of war (535-553) Emperor Justinian finally conquered Italy, made it an Eastern province, established Catholicism as its State religion, made Ravenna the capital, and appointed a governor, known as an exarch. This Exarch was next in rank to the Patriarch of Constantinople and higher than the bishop of Rome. Through the Exarch of Ravenna the East appointed the Roman bishops who recognized their emperors as their superiors and supreme pontiffs.

Italy was divided into some three dozen duchies, ruled by bandits who continued to rob the Italian Catholics. Through mixed marriages with Catholic princesses the Arian rulers

were gradually converted. Toulouse, France, remained the Arian capital till the conversion of King Reccared (586). Spain was Arian till the Council of Toledo (589). The Italian dukes remained Arian till Agilulf (590) embraced Catholicism and made peace with the Roman Trinitarians. Gregory the Great (590–604) inherited the bishopric of Rome just at a time of peace, and without any merits of his own received the appellation of 'great'. He was not only subject to the East, but he failed to become archbishop of all of Italy. Milan, Ravenna and Naples remained independent bishoprics. The Lombards, enemies of Gregory, remained Arian (568–774) till their states were converted into Papal States (8th cent.). Gregory's jurisdiction did not reach much farther than the city of Rome, the heel and toe of Italy and the islands of Sicily and Corsica. The barbarian Catholics of Gaul respected the bishop of ancient Rome, but cannot be called his subjects. Gregory merely became a well-known Catholic bishop in Italy even as his contemporary St. Isidore (d. 636), Catholic bishop of Seville, became famous in Spain. Isidore not only remained independent from Rome, but his Book of Sentences remained the theological textbook of the entire West till Spain surrendered to Rome in 1073 (*Migne, P.L.* 148, 289). Historians, therefore, should speak of the 'rise of the Roman Patriarchate' under Gregory the Great, but they should not speak of the rise of the papacy. A papacy cannot rise, unless it exists. All historical evidence points out that it did not exist.

If Constantinople had claimed the primacy in the 11th century, many authors of today would show us how this Eastern Papacy already existed in the days of Gregory the Great. In the same manner it is wrong to mention instances out of the lives of Leo I, etc., as proof of an early Western Papacy. The early Roman attempts to greater jurisdiction were actually patriarchal claims, not papal.

Early factors which contributed to the rise of the Roman



Papacy in the 11th century are (1) the extreme West had never joined the Ecumenical Church; (2) the Western monks (Benedictines) who controlled the Roman bishopric from the 6th century on, also converted Great Britain, Germany and other parts of the West; (3) the bishop of Rome became a temporal ruler by the middle of the 8th century; (4) Charlemagne united Germany and Italy into one empire and was so anxious to be called a "Roman" emperor that he made the Bishop of Rome the spiritual head of his empire (in name only) and forced this bishop to consecrate him emperor; (5) the East had several patriarchates, but Rome was the only apostolic See in the West; (6) the theological differences which caused the first (867) and the final (1054) schisms between East and West.

The 8th-century bishops of Rome were mainly illiterate bandits who sought the income of the Papal States and who obtained this bishopric by bribery, murder and war. Cardinal Baronius calls these bishops "Apostates" (renegades), and he calls the 10th-century bishopric of Rome 'the reign of the whores' (*Baronius, Annales, vol. 15, p. 501 & 639*). The Western bishops were so illiterate that they signed their documents with an "X" (*Migne, P.L. 89, 314 & 338*). Their papal writings were the work of some literate deacon (*P.L. 89*).

The West was overrun by barbarians. It had no scholarship. The Greeks despised the Western Church. The East convoked the Ecumenical Councils, not only without the approval of Rome but often without her knowledge. Gregory the Great was an appointee of the East. His consecration needed the approval of the Eastern emperor.

The Patriarch of Constantinople, though not occupying an apostolic See like Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, etc., was jurisdictionally the equal of any other primate, and, because he was the bishop of the capital, he was considered

the first bishop of the universal church, holding a primacy of honor and using the title of Universal Bishop (*"Universalis Sacerdos"*). In the days of Gregory the Great the patriarchs John and Cyriac signed their synodical letters with "Universal Bishop" without claiming universal jurisdiction as do the popes of today. Gregory of Rome vigorously protested against this title (*Migne, P.L. 77, 1004*) and wrote directly to the Emperor: "I can assure you that anyone who calls himself, or who desires to be called 'Universal Bishop', is in his elation the forerunner of Antichrist, because he proudly puts himself above all others" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 891*). Bishop Gregory did not tell the Emperor that the bishop of Rome was the head of the church, but he said that *any* bishop who dares to put himself above other bishops is creating the office of the Antichrist. It is, therefore, not only very unscholarly but very unjust as well to designate a man as the first "pope" or as the "father of the papacy", when actually he was the first Roman bishop to identify any papacy, whether in the East or in the West, with the Antichrist.

As to Gregory's scholarship and character, we must realize that his so-called "Epistles" are not his, but those of his deacon-secretary. These works have been revised in the 9th century, as this is clear from quotations of Bede and from such late expressions as "Celebrating Mass". His original manuscripts are lost. Scholars, like Thomas James, who have compared modern printed texts with the oldest texts and quotations extant, have found from 1,000 to 13,000 spurious passages.

Gregory never speaks of a "purgatory", but a 9th-century interpolation speaks of "cleansing fire" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 393*), a pagan belief. He was a very superstitious and dishonest man, not versed in the Scriptures, but versed in pagan mythology. He tells the most fantastic stories and falsely swears that he saw it with his own eyes. The morals of this monk

are under suspicion, not only because he forbade his married clerics to have relations with their wedded wives, but also because of his peculiar motive for sending missionaries to Britain.

## CHAPTER THREE

### TRADITION

#### *IS IT NOT TRUE THAT TRADITION IS AS RELIABLE AS THE BIBLE OR ANY OTHER HISTORICAL DOCUMENT?*

Both the Bible (*Col. 2:8*) and the early Councils (*Mansi 1, 957*) condemn tradition as a safe rule of faith. By the 16th century, when Rome had completely departed from the teachings of the Bible and when it wished to oppose the Protestant teaching that the Word of God is the sole rule of faith, the Council of Trent (1546) invented the theory that many or most of the teachings of Jesus had never been recorded in the early centuries, but had been handed down by way of mouth from Jesus to the apostles, from the apostles to the early bishops of Rome, etc., and were finally put in writing by the popes of the Middle Ages.

The Council of Trent teaches that the true teachings of Christ can be found "in written books and in unwritten traditions (*sine scripto traditionibus*), which were received by the apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself (*ex ipsius Christore*).” "This Council receives and venerates with equal pious affection and reverence all the books both of the New and the Old Testaments . . . together with the said Traditions"

(*Mansi* 33, 22). Rome, therefore, holds that her traditions are equal to the teachings of the Scriptures; or, that the word of God is not superior to the traditions of men.

Father Adam, professor of Catholic theology, writes: "We Catholics acknowledge readily, without any shame, nay with pride, that Catholicism cannot be identified simply and wholly with primitive Christianity, nor even with the Gospel of Christ" (*Dr. Karl Adam, The Spirit of Catholicism*, p. 2). This priest wants us to believe that the Church gradually grew to perfection and that the church of the illiterate, medieval popes ("the reign of the whores") had become more perfect than the church in the days of Christ and the apostles.

We know that Roman doctrines and practices were not handed down from Peter to later Roman bishops. For example, about the year 200 the Alexandrian Church of Egypt taught the doctrine of original sin and held that Infant Baptism was of apostolic origin (*Migne, P.G. 14, 1034*). Her direct neighbor, the Latin church of Carthage, Africa, taught adult baptism (*Migne, P.L. 1, 1330*). The early Roman Church of Italy followed the Latin Church of Africa in her practice of adult baptism. In the fifth century the African church condemned the baptismal views of Pelagius and wrote a book "On Original Sin" (*Migne, P.L. 45*). At first Rome followed the heretic, Pelagius, but after the Pelagian heresy (400–529 A.D.), she fully adopted the African doctrine of original sin and gradually introduced infant baptism. If it is true that Peter preached in Rome and baptized babies there in the year 67 A.D., then it is equally true that one century later Peter's oral traditions were totally forgotten. "The fuller teaching on the subject of original sin, occasioned by the Pelagian heresy, gradually led to the administration of Baptism to Infants . . . Hence the Catechumenate gradually fell into disuse" (*C.E. 5, 78; 3, 431*). The early church of Rome held that only fully instructed adults could be baptized; that

baptism should be administered only once a year, at Pentecost (Whitsunday); that those who were baptized as babies could not qualify as clergy. Nearly all early traditions of Rome have now been abolished or declared heresies: her ritualless worship, her catechumenate, agape, public penance, adult baptism, baptism by immersion, leavened bread, communion under both kinds, married status of her clergy, etc. etc. Practices which did not exist in the early centuries were introduced in the late Middle Ages, such as: indulgences, auricular confessions, statues, holy water, candles, scapulars, rosaries, novenas, stations of the cross, etc. etc. These new "traditions" did not come from "Peter" or "by way of mouth". Catholic Cardinal Newman says that "incense, lamps, and candles; votive offerings, . . . Holy Water . . . holydays and seasons . . . processions, blessings of the fields; sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure . . . images . . . are all of PAGAN ORIGIN" (*Newman, Development of Christian Doctrine*, 1949 ed., p. 349).

The Bible says that no one, not even an angel, is authorized to introduce new teachings (*Gal. 1:8*). St. Cyprian (d. 258) writes: "What presumption is this to prefer human tradition to divine ordinance . . . for tradition without truth is merely the antiquity of error" (*Migne, P.L. 3, 1178 & 1181*). "In the Gospel the Lord said: 'I am the Truth'. He did not say: 'I am Tradition' . . . We ought rather to follow the truth than tradition" (*Council of Carthage, 256 A.D., canon 30; Mansi 1, 957*). If tradition teaches us anything it teaches us that tradition is unreliable. Bishop Tertullian (d. 230), for example, is the first of the Latin Fathers and the founder of Latin Christianity, yet the Latin Church of today calls him a heretic. For the sake of illustration we will quote just a few canon laws of the early church:

St. Ignatius (c. 100), Bishop of Antioch and successor of St. Peter, writes: "Without a bishop it is not permitted either to baptize or to celebrate the Lord's Supper (agapen)" (*Migne, P.G. 5, 714*).

Council of Neo-Caesarea, 314 A.D., canon 12: "If a man is baptized when ill, he cannot be ordained" (*Mansi 2, 548*).

Pope Siricius (d. 399): "No clergyman is ever allowed to do penance" (*Migne, P.L. 13, 1118*).

Pope Leo (d. 461): "For while we put off the vows (of Baptism) of those who are not pressed by ill health . . . we do not refuse . . . anyone in danger of death" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 701*).

Pope Gelasius I (d. 496): "We have been informed that some people in a certain region only partake of the portion of the sacred body and abstain from the cup of sacred blood . . . They should either receive the whole sacrament or they should abstain altogether, because one cannot divide this one and the same mystery without committing a great sacrilege" (*Migne, P.L. 59, 149*). The same pope decreed that no one is allowed to be baptized "outside the feasts of Easter and Pentecost" (*Gelasius, Ep. 9, canon 10; Migne, P.L. 59*).

Pope Gregory I (d. 604): "Those who are constituted in Sacred Orders . . . are not to leave their wives" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 996*). When this pope speaks of "taking a sacrament" he means: taking an oath (*P.L. 77, 572*).

Pope Gregory II (d. 731): "If any layman out of greed has committed perjury, he must give all his goods to the poor, and shall be tonsured and serve in a monastery all the days of his life" (*Migne, P.L. 89, 531*).

Pope Gregory III (d. 741) allowed the clergy to do penance: "If any Pontiff commits fornication . . . he must do penance for seven years" (*Migne, P.L. 89, 590*).

Pope Leo IV (d. 853) decreed that Baptism can be administered only once a year, on Holy Saturday, and that the laity may receive communion three times a year (*Migne, P.L. 115, 679; 115, 675*).

Pope John XV (993) is the first pope to canonize a saint (*C.E. 8, 428*). This first canonized saint was St. Ulrich (d. 973), Bishop of Augsburg, who taught the doctrine of three sacraments, and who celebrated communion four times a year (*Migne, P.L. 135, 1072*). This 'heretic' has subsequently been kicked out of the Roman ritual.

St. Alfred, Archbishop of Canterbury (1006 A.D.), canon 27: "No priest may sell his services for money, nor may he ask for it anything whatsoever: neither for Baptism nor for any other service he may perform" (*Migne, P.L. 139, 1474*).

Council of Winchester, 1079 A.D., canon 8: "That in churches no Masses are to be celebrated except by consecrated bishops" (*Mansi 20, 460*).

Peter Abelard (1141), Abbot and founder of scholasticism, taught "that the power of binding and loosing was given to the apostles only, not to their successors" (*Mansi 21, 569*).

Pope Alexander III in 1150 speaks of "the Sacrament of the Incarnation," after which he writes on the three sacraments of Baptism, Chrism and Eucharist, and concludes with the church-instituted rite of Penance. St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) in his *Summa* follows Pope Alexander (the sacraments of Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders and Matrimony are later additions to the *Summa* of Aquinas).

Pope Innocent III (d. 1216), like Pope Leo I, Pope Gelasius I, Pope Gregory I, St. Augustine, St. Bernard, St. Thomas Aquinas, etc., denied the Immaculate Conception of Mary (*Migne, P.L. 217, 581*).



The Council of Constance (1415) and the Council of Trent (1545) forbade the cup to the laity. The Ecumenical Council of Basle (1432), "legitimately assembled with the H. Ghost", in its 2nd session, passed the decree: "That a General Council is above the Pope" (*Mansi* 29, 21). The Vatican Council of 1870, against the protest of the greatest scholars (Hefele), made the Pope infallible and placed him above all bishops (*Mansi* 51 & 52).

Pope Pius IX (1854), contrary to his predecessors, made the Immaculate Conception of Mary a dogma of faith (*Bull "Ineffabilis Deus"*; *Denzinger*, 1641). Pope Pius XII (1950) made the Assumption of Mary a dogma of faith, though it is a fraud and forgery of the Western Church (*C.E.* 2, 6).

No intellectual, whether Protestant or Catholic, could possibly believe that the popes "by way of mouth" knew all along that Mary was conceived without original sin, and that they kept it a secret for hundreds of years. Rome does not care whether a few intellectuals know the truth about her deceptions as long as she has some explanation for her uneducated masses. The masses are her strength, not the educated.

## CHAPTER FOUR

### MEDIEVAL FORGERIES

*ARE YOU NOT MISTAKEN WHEN YOU SAY THAT  
MASSES, INDULGENCES, PAPACY, ETC., ARE NOT  
MENTIONED BY THE FATHERS OF THE CHURCH?*

When I speak of the Fathers of the Church I mean their authentic writings, not spurious works or mutilated texts. The Catholic Encyclopedia admits the existence of thousands of forgeries and divides the works of nearly every Father into (1) genuine, (2) dubious and (3) spurious. Father Migne has printed hundreds of admitted forgeries in his collection of the Fathers. Works, which are considered genuine, have been mutilated by copyists who corrected obsolete teachings and expressions. Such Roman inventions as Peter's martyrdom at Rome (2nd cent.), Assumption of Mary (6th cent.), Temporal power of the bishop of Rome (8th cent.), Primacy of Rome (11th cent.), Seven Sacraments (13th cent.), etc., can only be proved by forgeries. The opposition to Masses, Purgatory and Indulgences (16th cent.) came after the invention of the printing press, and the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception (19th cent.) came so late that even the Summas of Albertus, Bonaventure and Aquinas,

were in print and in the hands of Protestants. While Catholic scholars like Bishop Hefele, Msgr. Duchesne and some contributors to the Catholic Encyclopedia admit the apocryphal nature of thousands of books, Catholic professors and authors (most of whom never read a medieval book in their lives) freely quote spurious texts to prove their point.

For every Father there is a forger. Catholic scholars speak of Pseudo-Clement, Pseudo-Cyprian, Pseudo-Ambrose, Pseudo-Athanasius, Pseudo-Augustine, Pseudo-Isidore, Pseudo-Hugo of St. Victor, Pseudo-Peter of Poitiers, Pseudo-Gratian, etc. Some forgers of the 2nd and 3rd centuries wrote dozens of books and epistles under the biblical name of Clement (*Phil.* 4:2), falsely claiming to be a semi-apostle and the first bishop of Rome. These Clementine forgeries, which fill the first two volumes of Migne's Greek Fathers, were written to give the primitive Church of Rome a little more prominence. A fifth-century forger took the biblical name of Dionysius the Areopagite (*Acts* 17:34) and wrote many works which till the Reformation were held as genuine, apostolic writings. An Irish scholar of the 9th century translated them into Latin (*Migne, P.G.* 3; *P.L.* 122, 1026).

Unable to find any historical evidence for the canonicity of the Apocrypha, Roman theologians quote the Roman Councils under Pope Damasus (382), Pope Innocent I (405) and Pope Gelasius I (496), all of which are forgeries (*C.E.* 1, 615; 3, 272).

St. Cyprian (d. 258), like his predecessor, Tertullian, constantly ridicules the pagan system of a Supreme Pontiff, a Pope (pater patrum, bishop of bishops), a primacy, etc. (*Mansi* 1, 951; 4, 430; *Migne, P.L.* 3, 1092; 3, 1172; 4, 423; etc.). Where his oldest MSS read: "The other apostles were indeed what Peter was: endowed with the same share of honor and jurisdiction" (*Migne P.L.* 4, 515), we now have texts which read: "The other apostles were indeed what Peter

was, but the Primacy is given to Peter." The Catholic Encyclopedia comments: "It is of course spurious in this conflated form" (*C.E.* 4, 585).

St. Augustine (d. 430) is constantly quoted by the clergy as having said: *Roma locuta, res finita*; when Rome has spoken the case is settled. Augustine never said anything of the sort (*Migne P.L.* 38, 734). St. Augustine in his sermons constantly explains the petrine text by saying that the church is not founded on a man, but on Christ (*Migne P.L.* 32, 618; 36, 724; 38, 479; 38, 1239). His works today contain a sermon (no. 190) "On the Chair of St. Peter" which explains that "The Lord called Peter the foundation of the Church" (*Migne, P.L.* 39, 2100). Catholic scholars not only admit that this sermon is spurious, but also his sermon "On the Assumption of Mary" (*P.L.* 39, 2130), the alleged "Rule of St. Augustine", and entire works like "De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus" (*P.L.* 58, 979).

Pope Gelasius (496) is said to have decreed: "The book, entitled 'Transitus', i.e. the Assumption of St. Mary, is apocryphal" (*Migne, P.L.* 59, 162). It so happens that this papal decree itself is apocryphal.

The First Ecumenical Council (Nice, 325) wisely decreed that the status quo of all existing boundaries and jurisdiction of the national churches of Alexandria, Rome, Antioch, etc., should remain unchanged (*canon 6; Mansi 2, 670*), and all ecumenical councils stressed that the national churches enjoy the same prerogative of honour and jurisdiction (*Mansi 3, 559; 6, 1229*). We know that the Council of Nice (325) promulgated 20 canons (*Mansi 2, 635*). These 20 canons have been incorporated into many other documents, such as the African Council of 419 (*canon 137*); the Collection of canons by Isidore (d. 636), Bishop of Seville (*Migne P.L.* 84, 93); the 9th-century Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore (*Migne, P.L.* 130, 252); the famous collection of councils by Patriarch Theodore

Balsamon (d. 1195) (*Migne P.G.* 137, 218—310). Scholars like Bishop Hefele admit that Nice promulgated 20 canons only. Today we have manuscripts which give 40 canons, others have 60, others 80 and others 84 canons. The spurious 39th canon reads: "The Patriarch is to all those who are under his jurisdiction, just as he who occupies the See of Rome is the Head and Prince of all patriarchs." In the collection of 84 canons the 37th canon reads: "Let there be only four Patriarchs . . . and let there be a Prince and Chief over them, the Lord of the See of the divine Peter at Rome." Not only Catholic but Protestant authors as well quote these spurious texts without knowing their history.

In order to whitewash Pope Liberius (352) who embraced "the heretical perversity" of the Arians (*Migne, P.L.* 10, 678; 26, 1190; 27, 502), Catholic theologians claim that the Arians falsified the works of the Fathers. The same theologians admit that they themselves falsified the sacred books of other religions in order to win converts (*C.E.* 13, 770). Speaking of Papal Bulls, Catholic theologians claim: "With the development of the primacy in the Middle Ages the papal letters grew enormously in number" (*C.E.* 6, 202). "There can be no doubt that during a great part of the Middle Ages papal and other documents were fabricated in a very unscrupulous fashion" (*C.E.* 3, 57). Speaking of the thousands of miraculous relics of Rome, the same scholars admit that "the majority of which no doubt were fraudulent," a "multitude of unquestionably spurious relics" (*C.E.* 12, 737). The same scholars admit the following Roman frauds: the origin of the Rosary and the apparition of Mary to St. Dominic (*C.E.* 13, 186), the Scapular and the apparition of Mary to Simon Stock (*C.E.* 13, 511), the Santa Scala (*C.E.* 13, 455), the legends and relics of Veronica (*C.E.* 15, 362), the Holy Lance and St. Longinus (*C.E.* 8, 774), the Robe (*C.E.* 7, 400), the Sabbatine Privilege (*C.E.* 13, 289), etc. Yet these scholars are bound to confess

that the Word of God is not superior to these Roman traditions.

The life stories and writings of the early popes are spurious, as the Catholic Encyclopedia often admits under their names. The earliest Roman rituals (8th cent.) are spurious, falsely attributed to Popes Leo, Gelasius and Gregory (*Migne P.L.* 55 & 74 & 78).

St. Ambrose (d. 397), an Italian bishop, wrote a book "On the Mysteries", but his six books "On the Sacraments" are spurious. Yet both authors know only two sacraments (*Migne, P.L.* 16, 405 & 435). When scholars speak of an authentic work they do not imply that the text has come to us in its original form. Manuscripts were seldom copied for the sake of preservation, but rather for use as textbooks. Obsolete teachings and expressions were altered, while 'heretical' teachings were allowed to become extinct.

The entire structure of the Roman Church is built on forgeries, spurious epistles, spurious sermons, spurious miracles, spurious relics, spurious councils and spurious papal bulls. As early as the fifth century St. Augustine and the African council of 419 accused and convicted Pope Zosimus for having falsified the 5th canon of the Council of Nice (*Mansi* 4, 515; *Migne, P.L.* 50, 422). We have no space here to examine such forgeries as the Apostolic Canons, the Canons of Hippolytus, the Constitution of Sylvester, the Acts of Sylvester, the Symmachian Documents, etc., but we will briefly comment on the most important ones.

"The Apostolic Constitutions", a 4th century forgery which purports to be a collection of apostolic writings collected by Pope Clement I. Both the canons of the Ecumenical Councils and the canon laws of the Roman Church are based on these forgeries. When the Protestants exposed the fraud the fallible Church of Rome finally admitted her errors: "The Apostolic Constitutions were held generally in high esteem

and served as the basis for much ecclesiastical legislation. . . . As late as 1563. . . it was contended that it was the genuine work of the apostles" (*C.E.* 1, 636). Framing 'divine' laws and falsifying the Word of God is not the work of innocent Christians. Listen to what these impostors dared to say: "We, the twelve Apostles of the Lord, who are now together, give you in charge these Divine Constitutions concerning every ecclesiastical form, there being present with us Paul, the chosen vessel, our fellow apostle, and James the Bishop, and the rest of the Elders and the seven Deacons" (*Migne, P.G.* 1, 1070).

"The Donation of Constantine" was originally an 8th-century forgery which gave the pope temporal powers and possessions, and regal honors and privileges. Pope Sylvester (1000 A.D.) declared it a forgery. Pope Leo IX (1054) rewrote the text, as we have seen, and used it to prove his primacy (*Migne, P.L.* 130, 248; 143, 753; *Mansi* 2, 607). The forgery purports to be a fourth-century document written by Emperor Constantine to the bishop of Rome: "We. . . deem it right that, even as Blessed Peter is known to have been appointed as the Vicar of the Son of God on earth, so also the pontiffs who hold the place of that prince of the apostles, should receive from us and from the empire, a power of primacy (*principatus potestatem*). . . that he shall hold a primacy as well over the four principal sees: Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople and Jerusalem, as also over the churches of God throughout the entire world" (*Edict of Constantine; Mansi* 2; 607; *Labbe* 1, 1534). Even if this Edict or Donation were authentic, the Roman papacy would only date back to the 4th century and would be of human origin. "This document was never used. . . until the middle of the eleventh century. . . The first certain use of it at Rome was by Leo IX in 1054. . . As early as the fifteenth century its falsity was known. . . Its genuinity was yet occasionally de-

fended, and the document still further used as authentic, until Baronius (d. 1607)... admitted that the 'Donatio' was a forgery" (*C.E.* 5, 118—119). The post-Reformation Jesuits, like Cardinal Bellarmine, used this forgery, the spurious canons of Nice and the False Decretals of Isidore to prove the primacy of the bishop of Rome.

The Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore (9th-cent. forgery) have been published by Paul Hinschius (Leipzig, 1863) and by Father Migne (*P.L.* 130). "Nowadays every one agrees that these so-called papal letters are forgeries... The Middle Ages were deceived by this huge forgery... the official edition of the *Corpus Juris*, in 1580, upheld the genuineness of the false decretals... In 1628 the Protestant Blondel published his decisive study: 'Pseudo-Isidorus'... Since then the apocryphal nature... has been established as a fact" (*C.E.* 5, 773).

The *Liber Pontificalis* (Biographical Book of the Popes) started out as a sixth-century forgery by Pope Felix III (530). All patriarchates possessed chronological lists of their bishops and Rome created such a list nearly 500 years after its founding. Though this spurious list is partly based on the older Liberian Catalogue, it refers to legendary bishops, councils and canons. Throughout the Middle Ages new biographies were added to the Book of Pontiffs. Monsignor L. Duchesne was the first priest to receive the permission to publish the *Liber Pontificalis* (Paris, 1886—1892, two folio volumes). The Vatican must have cheated this great scholar and must have hidden numerous manuscripts, because the edition of Duchesne gives us no more information than the already printed histories by Eusebius, Sozomen, Rufinus, Epiphanius, Anastasius, etc. "The compiler of the *Liber Pontificalis* utilizes also some historical writings, a number of apocryphal fragments (e.g. the Pseudo-Clementine Recognitions), the *Constitutum Sylvestri*, the spurious Acts of the alleged Synod of the 275 Bishops under Sylvester, etc. and



the fifth century Roman Acts of Martyrs. Finally, the compiler distributed arbitrarily along his list of popes a number of papal decrees taken from unauthentic sources; he likewise attributed to earlier popes liturgical and disciplinary regulations of the sixth century" (*C.E.* 9, 225).

Catholic scholars admit one forgery after the other, but the Council of Trent upheld these forgeries as genuine "traditions" to which the Word of God is not superior. As neither the people nor the lower clergy could read or write in the early Middle Ages, it is clear that the Roman hierarchy itself corrupted and falsified the true traditions.

Even the "Summas" or "Books of Sentences" of the late medieval theologians like Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard, Peter of Poitiers, Hugo of St. Victor, Albert the Great, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas, Alexander of Hales, etc. have been falsified. St. Bonaventure (d. 1274), for example, believed in many sacraments ("plura sacramenta") and his conclusion that there are seven sacraments ("septem sunt et non plura") is spurious, placed between his original treatise on Baptism (*Bk 4, Dist. 2, chapt. 2*) and a later treatise on Baptism (*Bk 4, Dist. 3, chapt. 1; Bonaventura, Opera Omnia, Claras Aquas, 1901, vol. 4, pp. 47, 52, 53, 61*). His works have been so mutilated that Pope Leo XIII approved the 1885 edition only. Of this papally approved edition the Catholic Encyclopedia says: "The first volume alone contains 20,000 variant readings" (*C.E.* 2, 654). St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) believed in two or three sacraments, and the reference of seven sacraments in his Summa is spurious. The Council of Lyons (1274) adopted seven sacraments, and its promoters poisoned St. Thomas on his way to the council, St. Bonaventure was "poisoned" during the council (*C.E.* 2, 650), and the presiding pope, Gregory X, dropped dead on his way from the council.

Hugo of St. Victor (d. 1141) wrote a Summa, but the

Catholic Encyclopedia warns that "it is not the work of Hugh" (C.E. 7, 523). This Pseudo-Hugo believed in 12 sacraments and enumerates them (*Migne, P.L.* 176, 442). A spurious section of the spurious Summa of Hugh now speaks of seven sacraments (*P.L.* 177, 388). Peter of Poitiers (d. 1205) wrote a Summa (*P.L.* 211), but Catholic scholars admit that his "Summa on the Sacraments", "On the Mysteries of the Church", and his "Fifth Book of Sentences" (about the sacraments) are all forgeries. Alexander of Hales (d. 1245) wrote a Summa, but the third part which deals with the sacraments, is spurious. The works of the Scottish Franciscan scholar, John Duns Scotus (d. 1308) have been falsified and Rome admits that "many changes and additions were made" (C.E. 5, 195).

Hundreds of other works, which are either spurious or have been mutilated, constitute the bulk of Roman "traditions". What doctrines and traditions Rome may have a thousand years from now, no one can possibly predict. We know, however, that her traditions did not originate from the lips of Christ.

The texts of the Fathers and of the Councils, especially in their translations, will confuse the average reader. Protestant scholars, as a rule, will quote medieval sources only when the original manuscripts are still extant, or when the text is so contrary to modern Roman practices that the authenticity of the text may be safely assumed.

## CHAPTER FIVE

### BIBLE READING

#### *ARE ROMAN CATHOLICS FORBIDDEN TO READ THE BIBLE?*

Roman Catholics in the United States are not forbidden by church law to read the Catholic Bible, but indirectly they are discouraged from doing so. Catholic children study 'Bible history', but they do not study the exegesis of the text. Priests have no instructions from the hierarchy to conduct Bible classes, nor do they preach on the merits of Bible reading at home. In many countries it is impossible for the Catholic laity to read the Bible, because of the lack of an approved translation.

Bible reading among the laity is impossible unless the text is in the language of the people. The New Testament was originally written in Greek, because it was the language of the people. Rome never was much of a Bible Church. During the first four centuries it had no Latin Bibles and the Vulgate Bible of St. Jerome (c. 400) was not used to instruct the people. Sozomen (d. 448), famous church historian of the 5th century, compares the national churches and comments: "Rome to this day has no more than seven deacons... In

this city neither the Bishop nor anyone else teaches the people in church" (*Migne P.G.* 67, 1475–1478).

St. Boniface (750) converted Germany and used a German ritual for Baptism, the text of which has been preserved (*Migne P.L.* 89, 810). Charlemagne united Germany and Italy into one church, but refused to subject the people of Italy, Germany and Gaul to one and the same ritual. "There is no tongue in which prayer may not be offered" (*Council of Frankfort*, 794).

Roman Catholicism and the Papacy (1054) made Latin the liturgical language of the West, although it had become a dead language. When Gregory VII (1073) began to subject all Western nations to his jurisdiction he imposed this dead language on them. He wrote to the King of Bohemia and forbade the use of the ritual "in the Slavic language." In the same letter he warned the Bohemian people against the reading of the Bible "which may lead men of perverse intellect into error" (*Migne P.L.* 148, 555).

Twelfth-century France possessed New Testament Bibles and Psalters in the French language, and the laity of many cities had formed Bible study groups. The Bishop of Metz tried to suppress this evangelical movement under the pretext that these studies were without priestly supervision. The people would have welcomed church supervision, but, as today, there was none. Pope Innocent III (1199) in two letters to the people of Metz warns the laity to refrain from teaching the Word of God (*Migne, P.L.* 214, 595). This pope, who was fighting the protesting sects of Albigenses and Waldenses and who murdered more than a million heretics, never gave the true reason for suppressing the Bible. "The sacred mysteries of the faith are not to be expounded indiscriminately to all," writes this pope, because "such is the profoundness of the Holy Scriptures that not only the simple and the illiterate, but even the prudent and learned are not competent at all to

discover its meaning." The Catholic people, whom the pope calls "simple" and "illiterate" and whom the Catholic scholars call "utterly uncritical" and "curiously morbid" (*C.E.* 12, 737), are to preserve their blind faith in their priests.

In the beginning of the 13th century – before the growing power of the Dominicans, Franciscans and the Inquisition—Germany, France and Spain possessed translations of the Bible in their native tongues. Rome burned these Bibles under the pretext that they contained faulty translations, without publishing authorized translations. When the laity of Latin extraction still managed to use the Latin text for study groups, the Western Church placed all Bibles on the Index of Forbidden Books, including the Latin Vulgate. Only the Psalter, which was part of the ritual, could be used by laymen, if read in Latin. The Council of Toulouse (1229) decreed: "We forbid the laity to possess the books of the Old and New Testament, with the possible exception of the Psalter" (*canon 14; Mansi 23, 197*). The Councils of Valencia and Toledo (1229) passed similar legislation for Spain. The Council of Taragona (1234) condemned any and all translations of the Bible: "No one may possess the books of the Old or New Testament in the native language (in Romanico). And if anyone has them, he must within eight days after this publication...hand them over to the local bishop to be burned" (*Mansi 23, 329*). Not only the reading, but the simple possession of a family Bible became a crime punishable by death. Regardless of what pretexts Roman theologians may bring forward, anyone who understands the massacres of the Inquisition knows that Rome did not encourage Bible reading.

John Wycliff (d. 1384) risked his life by translating the Bible into English. Archbishop Thomas Arundel of Canterbury condemned the Bible of Wycliff (*Mansi 26, 1031*), and the Council of Oxford (1408) decreed: "We, therefore, decree

and ordain that no one by his own authority may translate any text of Sacred Scripture into the English language or in any other" (*Mansi* 26, 1038). When Guttenberg (d. 1468) invented the printing press and began to publish German Bibles, the Archbishop of Mainz (1486) excommunicated any and all laymen who, without his permission, bought or sold them. In true Roman fashion the archbishop ridiculed "the women and lower classes" for thinking that they could understand the Bible. Those who sought a permit to sell Bibles were accused of witchcraft and other crimes and were executed.

When Martin Luther translated the Bible for the first time into the High German, Rome was unable to stop him. William Tyndale translated the entire Bible into English, but Bishop Tunstall burned his Bibles in 1530 and burned the author in 1536. In 1551 Spain forbade the printing of any Bible in the Spanish language. The Low Countries till this day have no Bibles in their native tongue except Protestant Bibles, the reading of which is forbidden. As though afraid to be understood or to be found out, Rome anathematized anyone who maintained that the Mass ought to be celebrated in the language of the people (*Council of Trent*, 1562; *Mansi* 33, 132). Even translations of the Fathers of the Church were placed on the Index of Forbidden Books. Students were forbidden to read Hebrew Bibles or ancient Latin Bibles. By multiplying her forgeries and by restricting the printing of ancient manuscripts, Rome prevented her scholars from comparing modern texts with the originals.

Post-Reformation Indices list more than one hundred forbidden editions of the Bible. All bookstores were regularly examined by officials and secret agents. Anyone caught printing a Bible without a license was publicly branded with a cross-shaped hot iron, had an eye removed by a public executioner, or had his hand cut off. Anyone caught selling

a Bible without a license was sentenced to death, or he was exiled and had his possessions confiscated. Only after England was definitely lost to the Reformation and Protestant Bibles in English became plentiful in Great Britain, did Rome publish her first English Catholic Bible, the Douay version, in 1610.

In 1864 Pope Pius IX in his Syllabus of Errors attacked the famous Bible Societies, as if they were the greatest enemies of God and man. All Protestant Bibles were placed on the Index (*Mechlin, 1897*). The Roman Catholic English Bible was published reluctantly, mainly so that Protestants cannot accuse the English speaking church of Rome of not having a Bible at all. The preface to the Douay version says: "The Church warns readers of the Bible to beware of interpreting it according to their own whims, caprices, and judgments, as so many have done to their own spiritual ruin. She has even restricted by legislation the promiscuous reading of the Bible by the uncultured and the ignorant who sometimes have presumed to interpret even the most difficult passages in it, as the first 'Reformers' insanely did" (*London, 1911*). Even Martin Luther, a priest, doctor of theology, professor of Holy Scripture and famous Bible translator, is classified among the insane for reading the Bible, while the laity are called "uncultured" and "ignorant".

In Catholic seminaries the study of Moral Theology, Dogmatic Theology, Canon Law and Church History has always preference over the study of the Bible. In many cases the priest-student merely studies an "Introduction to the O.T. and N.T.". As these textbooks are often in Latin, the average priest will have less knowledge of the Bible than the average Protestant Sunday school teacher.

Rome holds that only the pope is infallible and he alone may interpret the Bible. All private interpretation is forbidden. This ruling makes Bible classes impossible, because

no parish priest may use his own interpretation while no pope of Rome has ever written a commentary on the Bible. In conscience a priest may not even explain the very first verse of the Bible, because there is no *ex cathedra* papal interpretation for it.



## CHAPTER SIX

### 'BY FAITH ALONE'

*DID DR. MARTIN LUTHER FALSIFY THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE IN ORDER TO PROVE THAT SALVATION IS "BY FAITH ALONE"?*

The Bible teaches that salvation is by faith alone, that faith is a gift of God, and that those who have been saved will abound in good works. Grace, Faith and Works are inseparable, yet works are not the cause but the effect of God's saving grace: "For by grace ye have been saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God. It is not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are His workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works" (*Eph. 2:8-10*). Paul explained to the Christians of Rome: "And if it is by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. For if it were of works, then it is no more grace" (*Rom. 11:6*). Faith is invisible, but it manifests itself through works: "By their fruits ye shall know them" (*Matt. 7:20*). If faith bears no fruit, it has died: "Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead" (*James 3:17*).

If Romanism still holds that the entire Bible is the Word of God, it should not quote James and hide the text which

Paul wrote to the early Roman church. If Paul and James were both inspired, they could not contradict each other. Every historian knows that the early church preached salvation by grace (free gift of God), and that the medieval church of Rome amassed her wealth by preaching salvation by works. When the Reformers restored the biblical teaching of grace, the founder of the Jesuits told his order: "It must also be borne in mind that, although it is most true that no one is saved unless he is predestinated, nevertheless we must speak with circumspection about this subject...we should not speak too often on this subject. When we do speak on it, we ought so to temper with what we say as to give the people who listen no occasion of erring...Consequently many will neglect their good works" (*Ignatius Loyola, Spiritual Exercises, II, 14-15*).

Rome further sought to befog the issue by changing the definition of salvation and making it synonymous with 'glorification'. The first word is negative, the latter positive; the first refers to a state of being saved, freed, delivered from the punishment of sin while yet on earth; the latter refers to a state of bliss after death.

When the Bible teaches that man cannot be saved by his own works, it holds that salvation is by faith 'alone'. To emphasize this, Martin Luther added to the margin of his Latin Bible the word "sola", *alone*. That is not falsifying the meaning of Scripture, but clarifying it in its translation. Father Conway charges: "He deliberately perverted the meaning of St. Paul in Romans by adding the words 'only' (*nur*) in Rom. 3:20 and Rom. 4:15, and 'alone' in Rom. 3:28" (*Question Box, p. 81*).

That Martin Luther did not pervert the meaning is admitted by the greatest scholars. Monsignor Duchesne frankly admits that the early Church of Rome taught that "salvation, justification, that is to say, reconciliation with God, can

ONLY come through faith" (*Duchesne, Early History of the Christian Church, vol. 1, p. 23-24*). What Martin Luther taught was the accepted interpretation of the Fathers.

St. Hilary (d. 368), Bishop of Poitiers, interpreting Matt. 9:2, writes: "And it was remitted unto him what the Law could not do, for justification is by faith ALONE (*fides enim SOLA justificat*)" (*Hilarius Pictav., Comment. on Matt.; Migne, P.L. 9, 961*).

Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) agreed with Martin Luther that without faith our works are fruitless and sinfully impure: "A mighty fortress is a sound faith, a true faith . . . without it nothing is holy, nothing is pure, nothing alive, for 'the just lives by faith' (Rom. 1:17)" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 207*).

St. Fortunatus (d. 605), Bishop of Poitiers, explains the remission text of the Apostles' Creed by saying: "faith ALONE suffices" (*Fortunatus, Comment. on the Creed; Migne, P.L. 88, 351*).

St. Bruno (d. 1101), founder of the Carthusian Order, wrote a commentary on the Epistles of Paul and explains Rom. 4:15 (the very text referred to by Father Conway) as follows: "There is no justification except by faith alone (*per fidem tantum*) . . . by faith alone (*per solam fidem*) . . . faith alone suffices (*sola fides sufficit*)" (*Bruno, Comment. on Rom. 4; Migne, P.L. 153, 43-44*).

It is evident, therefore, that the words: *only, alone, sola, tantum, nur, allein*, do not pervert the meaning of the text, because Luther merely followed the interpretation of the popes and saints of the early church. Luther's translation was interpretively correct. Perversion of the meaning of a scriptural text is effected when a word is taken out and substituted by a word with the opposite meaning, as in the Catholic Bible, Gen. 3:15 "She (*ipsa*) shall crush the head of the serpent", instead of the old text: "He (*ipse*)" (*Migne, P.L. 28, 200*).

## CHAPTER SEVEN

### APOCRYPHA

#### *ARE THE APOCRYPHA INSPIRED AND IS THE PROTESTANT BIBLE INCOMPLETE?*

Roman Catholic authors often claim that "the church" did not have a fixed Bible until the years 393, 397 and 419 A.D., when the Councils of Hippo and Carthage allegedly settled the *Canon* of the Bible, including the seven Apocrypha (*C.E.* 3, 278). A few Roman authors vaguely imply that the church did not have a Bible during the first four centuries, and that from 400 to 1517 all Bibles contained the Apocrypha. Nearly all anti-Protestant authors claim that Martin Luther deliberately threw out such books as Maccabees, because it taught the existence of purgatory: "It is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins" (*II Macc.* 12:46).

The works of St. Cyprian (d. 258) contain over 2,000 Bible quotations, and his contemporary, Origen, wrote a complete commentary on every verse of every book of the Bible. No patrologist will hold that the early church had no Bible. Neither will a student of the Apocrypha maintain that *II Maccabees* 12:46 refers to purgatory. There is a great difference between "prayers for the dead" and "purgatory". The Greek Orthodox Church believes in the first, but not in

the latter. The Roman Catholic Purgatory (15th cent.) is allegedly a place for those who die in venial (small) sin, and it will cease to exist after the day of resurrection. The sacrifices for sin, brought by Judas Maccabee, were for soldiers who had been caught in an act of mortal sin and were struck dead by God Himself (II Macc. 12:40). The prayers were not to benefit the dead till the Day of Resurrection (II Macc. 12:43). The author of this book is an Egyptian, Greek-speaking Pharisee who had become influenced by Egyptian mythology. The Books of Moses do not mention such sacrifices. Second Maccabees was not written till 165 B.C. when the Hebrew Canon (O.T.) had been closed for centuries.

The Apocrypha (seven extra books of the Catholic Bible) supposedly belong to the Old Testament or the Hebrew Bible. Neither the Palestinian Jews in the days of Christ (*Josephus*, "Against Apion," bk 1, Art. 8), nor the Jews of today include these books in their Hebrew Bible. For brevity's sake we will examine only the most important Fathers who have written on the subject.

St. Melito (c. 170), the first Christian to draw up a list of all canonical books, rejects the Apocrypha (*Migne*, P.G. 20, 398). Origen (c. 248), the first Father of the Church to write a complete commentary on the Bible, rejects the Apocrypha (*Migne*, P.G. 20, 582). Eusebius, first Christian to write a History of the Church, rejects the Apocrypha (*Migne*, P.G. 20, 582). The Council of Laodicea (c. 363), the first council to speak of the Canon of the Bible, not only rejected the Apocrypha, but forbade their reading in the churches (*Mansi* 2, 573). The Codex Vaticanus (c. 370), the oldest Septuagint copy in existence and the property of the Vatican, does not have the Books of Maccabees.

St. Jerome (c. 400) at the request of the bishop of Rome translated the Bible into Latin and gave the Roman Church

its first official Bible, the Vulgate. Jerome also translated the apocryphal books of the Septuagint, but warned his readers that these books were not canonical and may not be used for the purpose of establishing Christian doctrine (*Migne, P.L.* 28, 83). "St. Jerome," says the Catholic Encyclopedia, "cast his weighty suffrage on the side unfavourable to the disputed books" (*C.E.* 3, 272); and Father Conway comments: "the fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries, influenced by St. Jerome, denied the canonicity of the deuterocanonical books" (*Question Box*, p. 63). We see, therefore, that "the church" could not have decreed in the years 393, 397 and 419 that the apocrypha were canonical, because all theologians and leaders of that era denied that they were canonical scriptures.

Throughout the Middle Ages the official Latin Vulgate warned its readers that the Apocrypha, though included for pious reading, were not inspired. Father Migne has reprinted a ninth-century copy of the Vulgate which still carries St. Jerome's warnings in its prefaces (*Migne, P.L.* vol. 29).

Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) used the Vulgate, and when he quoted in one of his sermons a passage from the First Book of Maccabees, he apologized for using non-canonical material (*Migne, P.L.* 76, 119). Hugo of St. Victor (c. 1135), the first 'Roman Catholic' theologian of note, warns that the Apocrypha are not inspired (*Migne, P.L.* 175, 15). Down through the Middle Ages none of the leading theologians, such as St. Thomas Aquinas, St. Bonaventure, etc., taught that the apocrypha were inspired, but they rather warned their pupils that they were non-canonical. Cardinal Ximenez (d. 1517), a Franciscan scholar and Primate of Spain, and Cardinal Cajetan (d. 1534), world famous Dominican scholar of Italy, denied the canonicity of the apocrypha in the days of Martin Luther.

When Dr. Martin Luther (d. 1546) translated the Bible

into the High German and also translated the Apocrypha for pious reading, he merely followed St. Jerome and his own contemporaries in warning his readers that these additional books of the Septuagint were not inspired. The Council of Trent, however, on April 8, 1546, in its 4th session, was so anxious to oppose any and all teachings of the Reformers, that it did not hesitate to contradict 1500 years of tradition and pronounced under pain of excommunication that the Apocrypha were inspired. The Council of Trent lasted 18 years and few bishops could afford to attend its sessions. A handful of attendants, almost without any study or discussion, nearly 1200 years after the Council of Laodicea, felt qualified to reverse the universal teaching of the church, and increased the number of books of the Old Testament, thinking that with the aid of them they could prove the existence of their late invented purgatory.

Martin Luther did not reject the books of Maccabees and the other Apocrypha for the reason some Catholic authors give today, but he followed the general belief of his day. The scholars of the Catholic Encyclopedia give this account: "The ancient Greek Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, was the vehicle which conveyed these additional Scriptures into the Catholic Church. . . In the Latin Church, all through the Middle Ages we find hesitation about the character of the deuterocanonicals. . . Few are found to unequivocally acknowledge their canonicity" (C.E. 3, 270-273).

The modern Catholic claim that St. Augustine and the African councils settled the canon of the Bible for the entire church and pronounced the apocrypha inspired is totally false: (1) the African councils were local councils, and their canons were not binding to the Ecumenical Church; (2) the African Council (419) merely lists all the books of the Septuagint, including the apocrypha, without decreeing which books are *canonical* (inspired) and which books are *eccle-*

*siastical* (approved by the church for inspirational reading); (3) the text of the African councils, and especially the text of St. Augustine has been mutilated; (4) even if Africa had canonized the apocrypha, we know that St. Jerome and the Roman Church of that time rejected them; (5) the fact that the early church had a special name for these seven books ("ecclesiastical books"), and the fact that the Roman Church of today still calls these disputed books "Deutero-canonical" (second-class), point to their admission that they are different and not fully inspired.

St. Augustine's City of God, bk 18, chapt. 36 is most clearly interpolated (*Migne, P.L. 41, 596*). In his Christian Doctrine, bk 2, chapt. 8, St. Augustine lists all the books of the Septuagint, both canonical and ecclesiastical, and clearly brings out that no African Council had ever settled the Canon of the Scriptures (*Migne, P.L. 34, 40*).

The same Council of Carthage (419), which in canon 29, or in canon 24, or in canon 27 (all manuscripts read differently) include the apocrypha, also decreed: (1) that no priest may reconcile anyone to communion (*canon 6 & 43; Mansi 4, 424*); (2) that bishops may have wives and children (*canons 15, 25, 35, 36; Mansi 4, 427*); (3) that Rome may not interfere with the affairs of the African Church (*canon 28; Mansi 4, 429*); (4) that no bishop may call himself Supreme Pontiff (*canon 39*); (5) that Africa ought to create peace between the church of Italy and the church of Egypt (*canon 101*); (6) that anyone of the African clergy who appeals to Rome is ipso facto excommunicated and defrocked (*canons 105, 125, 134; or canon 34 in Mansi 4, 431*); (7) that there is not such a place as a Limbo for unbaptized babies (*canon 110*); (8) that without the grace of God we cannot do good works (*canon 113*); (9) that God alone can forgive sins (*canon 114*); (10) that Pope Zosimus falsified the canons of the first Ecumenical Council of Nice



in order to obtain jurisdiction over the Latin province of Africa (*canon 134*); (11) that Pope Celestine has no jurisdiction whatsoever over the African Church (*canon 138*; *Mansi 4, 515*).

Roman Catholic theologians, especially when discussing the primacy of the Roman Church, would not dare to refer to the canons of this African Council as being inspired by the Holy Spirit, or as constituting infallible dogmas of "the" church. How then can an honest scholar refer to this council as having given the world the first complete Bible? The African Church has been overrun by the Goths and Vandals and is now extinct. Most of her records have been lost. If Rome for political reasons, as the African Council of 419 claims, did not hesitate to falsify the canons of an Ecumenical Council of the Universal Church, when Rome stands convicted by her own scholars of having falsified hundreds of documents and even of having fabricated canons of alleged councils which were never held, what makes one think that Rome would be afraid to mutilate the documents of an extinct church? In any case the Roman Church officially rejected the apocrypha before the year 393, during the years 393—419, and after the year 419. We have the official Vulgate of St. Jerome as proof.

## CHAPTER EIGHT

### BIBLE VERSUS ROME

#### *ARE ROMAN TEACHINGS AND PRACTICES CONTRARY TO THE TEACHINGS OF THE BIBLE?*

Most of the Roman practices are either non-biblical and man-made, or explicitly contrary to the teachings of the Bible. We have already mentioned the papacy, Catholic priesthood, Masses, etc., and we will mention many others in following chapters. Here we will briefly mention Mariolatry, celibacy and statue worship.

The recitation of the Rosary: the repetition of man-made prayers over the radio, at funerals, in church; the counting of beads as punishment and self-atonement for sin, is a practice which Rome adopted from the Mohammedans. Christ warns: "When you pray, use not vain repetitions like the heathen, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking" (*Matt. 6:7*).

Rome teaches that Mary is the Mediatrix (female mediator), the Door of Heaven (*porta coeli*), the refuge of sinners, the dispenser of all graces. Christ says: "I am the door" (*John 10:9*). "No one cometh unto the Father, but through Me" (*John 14:6*). "There is one mediator between God and man, the Man Jesus Christ" (*I Tim. 2:5*).

Rome claims that it has the power to forbid its clergy to marry. The Bible says that bishops and deacons ought to be "the husband of one wife" (*I Tim.* 3:2; 3:12), and speaks of their wives and children (*verses 4 & 11*). "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meat," warns the same Epistle, are "doctrines of devils" (*I Tim.* 4:1-3).

Rome makes statues in order to kneel and pray before them. She allows altars, candles, crowning, incense, processions, dedications, liturgies, relics and other forms of worship of her saints which the Bible forbids in the Commandments of God. Even the altars, Masses and religious services in honor of "Saint" Michael are contrary to the Bible: "Let no man beguile you...into worshipping of Angels" (*Col.* 2:18).

These practices and numerous others which are mentioned in this book are not only contrary to the Bible, but contrary to the Fathers, the Councils and the traditions of the early church.

## CHAPTER NINE

### THE ANTICHRIST

#### IS ROME THE ANTICHRIST?

The Bible speaks of "the Antichrist" (*I John* 2:18), "the Beast" whose "number is 666" (*Rev.* 13:18), "the Great Whore" (*Rev.* 17:1), "the Mother of Harlots" (*Rev.* 17:5), "Balaam" (*II Peter* 2:15), "Belial" (*II Cor.* 6:15), "False Teachers" (*II Peter* 2:1), "the Deceiver" (*II John* 7), "that Man of Sin", "the Son of Perdition" "who sitteth in the temple as a god" (*II Thess.* 2:4), etc.

From the very beginning, both East and West taught that many of these appellatives may refer to Rome. Even before the introduction of Latin in the church, the French bishop, St. Irenaeus (d. 202), explained *Rev.* 13:18 by saying: "*Lateinos* has the number 666, and it is very probable that this is the name of the last Kingdom (*Daniel* 2:40), because the Latins are those who now rule the world" ("*Against Heresies*", Bk 5, chapt. 30, art. 3; *Migne, P.G.* 7, 1206). The Greek letters of *Lateinos* are also numerals: L = 30, A = 1, T = 300, E = 5, I = 10, N = 50, O = 70, S = 200, which makes a total of 666.

The Italian Bishop, St. Hippolytus (d. 235), calls Pope Callistus "a man cunning in wickedness and clever in deception." "This Deceiver has founded a school opposed to the teachings of the Church." The followers of "the Wicked one" are not "Christians" (Christianoi), but "Callistians" (Kallistianoi) (*Hippolytus, Refutation of All Heresies, Bk 9, art. 7-12; Migne, P.G., vol. 16, part 3, p. 3369-3388*).

Sozomen (d. 448) says that Rome did not preach the Bible in church (*Migne P.G. 67, 1475*) and St. Basil the Great (d. 379) refers to Romanism as Westerners who "desire neither to learn nor to be taught the truth" (*Migne P.G. 32, 894*). Gregory the Great (d. 604), as Bishop of Rome, warned the Emperor not to create a papacy, because any bishop who assumes jurisdiction over other bishops is "the Forerunner of Antichrist" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 891*).

The Ecumenical Church in 680 anathematized Pope Honorius as "the Heretic", "as one fallen away from the faith" (*Mansi 11, 635; Migne P.L. 87, 1247*). By means of such forgeries as "the Acts of Sylvester" and "the Epistle of St. Peter" (*Migne P.L. 89, 1005*), Pope Stephen III (754) converted the Land of the Lombards into Papal States and proclaimed himself King. What the greatest Roman Catholic scholar, Monsignor Duchesne, says of these pope-kings has never been said of the era of Al Capone or the Mafia: "The Lateran became a resort of persons of ill fame, and no virtuous woman could remain in safety at Rome" (*Duchesne, Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, A.D. 754 to 1073; 1908 ed., p. 224*). The Venerable Italian Cardinal Baronius (d. 1607) describes the pope-kings of 752-901 A.D. by quoting the contemporary Genebrard: "This century is unfortunate, as for nearly 150 years the popes have fallen from all virtues of their predecessors, and have become *Apostates* rather than *Apostles*." These admissions explode the myth that there were just a "few bad popes."

Like all Italian dukes and bandits of that era, the pope-kings obtained their throne by bribery, murder or war, and were only interested in wealth and worldly pleasures.

Pope Leo IV died in August, 853. The East appointed the papal librarian as Pope Anastasius (853). Because he opposed statue worship, the West dethroned him and appointed what they thought to be a British monk. Pope John VIII (854–857). This pope actually was a nun, the illegitimate daughter of a monk. When this pregnant popess Joan gave birth during a religious procession, while riding horseback through the streets of Rome, the mob stoned her to death (857) and Pope Anastasius once more occupied the papal throne. The statue worshipping monks once more drove Anastasius out of Rome and appointed Benedict III. Because this British pope was a woman, she was not officially entered on the lists of pontiffs, but all pre-Reformation textbooks on the papacy explain the vacancy of 853–857 by mentioning Popess Joan either in the margin or in the text itself. Pope Anastasius (853 & 857) mentions her in his “History of the Roman Pontiffs” (*Migne, P.L.* 128, 1338). Sigbert of Gemblours (d. 1086) mentions Popess Joan under the year 854 (*Monumenta Germ. Hist., Script.* vol. 6, p. 470). The Benedictine monk, Marion Scott (d. 1086), places Popess Joan under the year 853 (*Migne, P.L.* 147, 771). Martin the Pole (d. 1278) in his “History of the Popes” writes: “After this Leo, John the Anglican, a Margantine by birth, reigned 2 years, 1 month, 4 days, and died at Rome... This pope, as we are told, was a woman, and in her youth was taken to Athens in male habit by her lover... Nor is she placed in the Catalogue of Pontiffs because of her female sex” (*Liber Pontificalis*, vol. 2, p. xxvi, between pp. 444–445). Bartholomew of Lucca (d. 1327) mentions her in his New Church History, and so do other authors who had access to the papal archives. Many statues were erected to commemorate the female

pope. Bishop John Burchard, official biographer of Pope Alexander VI, writes under the date of Dec. 27, 1486: "When he (Alexander) returned, he went by the Colosseum, and took the short cut, that is, where has been erected the statue of the Popess (imago Papissae), to indicate the place, as it is related, where John VII, an Englishman, bore a son" (*Burchard, Diarium, vol. 1, p. 233*). Not till forty years after the death of Martin Luther did Pope Sixtus V remove her statue from the Papal Gallery, and begin to deny her existence.

During the 9th and 10th centuries no woman, nun or virgin was safe in Rome because of the immorality of the popes. The Council of Trosly (909) cried out: "Fornication, adultery, sacrilege and murder have overwhelmed the world" (*Mansi 17A, 265*). Cardinal Baronius calls this period 'the reign of the whores'. He describes these Italian bandit-popes: "What a shame, what a pity. What monsters, horrible to behold. . . What evils did they not perpetrate, what tragedies did they not cause? With what impurities was this See. . . then stained; with what rottenness infected; with what filth defiled; and by these things blackened with perpetual infamy" (*Baronius, Annales, vol. 15, p. 501*). "And what sort of Cardinal Priests and Deacons were chosen by these monsters," asked Cardinal Baronius. The Catholic Encyclopedia answers that question: "The episcopal sees. . . were treated as property which descended by hereditary right from father to son. . . not only priests but bishops openly took wives and begot children to whom they transmitted their benefices" (*C.E. 3, 485*).

The Roman Whore, Theodora fell in love with the Bishop of Ravenna, and appointed him as Pope John X (914). When the Pope quarreled with Marozia, his concubine's daughter, the two women "placed a pillow over his mouth and thus smothered him in a most horrible manner. After his death,

they elected to pope the very son of Marozia, named John XI (931 A.D.), whom the same whore (meretrix ipsa) bore to Pope Sergius" (*Bishop Liutprand; Migne, P.L. 136, 852*). The *Liber Pontificalis* says that Pope John XI was the son of Pope Sergius (*vol. 2, p. 243*), and Cardinal Baronius admits that the pope was the illegitimate son of the same whore (*Annales, vol. 15, p. 639*). Pope John XII (955–964) was a sex maniac. The *Liber Pontificalis* says that "He spent his entire life in adultery" (*vol. 2, p. 246*). The people of Rome complained: "The Lateran Palace, which once was the meeting place of the saints, is now a public whore house" (*Migne P.L. 136, 900*). The Roman Council of 963 tried and convicted the pope of adultery "with the widow of Reynard, and with Stephanie, his father's concubine, and with the widow Anna, with his own granddaughter, and that he turned the Holy Palace into a brothel and whore house (*Sanctum Palatium lupanar et prostibulum fecisse*)" (*Mansi 17A, 466*). He drank like a pope, and toasted to the Devil (*Diaboli in amorem vinum bibisse*). He swore to "Jupiter, Venus and other Demons." He was conceived and he died in an act of adultery: "while he was enjoying himself with the wife of a certain man, he was struck dead by the Devil (*a Diabolo est percussus*)" (*Migne P.L. 136, 908*).

Pope John XV (985–996), the son of a Priest, distributed all the wealth of the church among his relatives (*Liber Pont. 2, 260*), and was "covetous of filthy lucre and corrupt in all his acts" (*Muratori, Annali, 5, 498*). The independent Church of France, fearing the rising power of Rome, convoked the Council of Rheims (991) and describes the Roman bishops as follows: "It is a publicly known fact that there is today hardly one person at Rome who, according to the saying, knows enough of letters to qualify for Door-keeper [lowest order]. Under what pretext shall he presume to teach who has never learned? . . . To such monsters, full of all infamy,



void of all knowledge, human and divine, are all the priests of God to submit? . . . The Roman Pontiff . . . seated on a lofty throne, glittering with purple and gold . . . puffed up by vain knowledge, is he not the Antichrist . . . the Man of Sin . . . the Mystery of Iniquity?" (*Mansi* 19, 132). Yet during the reign of these monster-popes, void of knowledge, the most fantastic theological changes were introduced and new "traditions" created.

Pope Benedict VI (972–974) was strangled by Pope Boniface VIII (974–975) (*Liber Pontificalis* II, 255). Pope Sylvester II (999–1003) calls Pope Boniface "a horrid monster surpassing all other mortals in wickedness" (*Mansi* 19, 132). Yet the Roman people mistrusted Pope Sylvester also: "the common people regarded him as a magician in league with the devil" (*Cath. Enc.* 14, 372).

Benedict IX (1032) became pope when he was a boy of ten years of age (*Migne, P.L.* 142, 679). This little infallible "monster" sold the papacy to his uncle, but later took it back by force. He still claimed to be pope during the Schism of 1054. "His life," writes Pope Victor III, "was so evil, so horrible, so execrable, that I shudder to describe it" (*Migne, P.L.* 149, 1003). "He neither feared the Lord, nor respected his fellowman" (*Migne P.L.* 150, 817).

Pope Leo IX (1054), the pope of the final schism, established his own "Roman Catholic Church" and assumed the title of the "Vicar of the Son of God" (*Vicarius filii Dei*) (*Migne P.L.* 130, 248; 143, 753; *Mansi* 2, 607). As the Latins use the alphabet as numerals (I = 1; V = 5; L = 50; C = 100; D = 500) the total of this title is "666" (*Rev.* 13:18). Pope Gregory VII (1073) subjected every independent church of the West, and his successors sent papal tax collectors and cardinals to extort money from the churches under pain of eternal damnation.

Emperor Frederick Barbarossa (d. 1190) wrote in 1159 to

Pope Adrian IV: "The churches are closed, the city gates will not open for the Cardinals, because they are not preachers but robbers; not peacemakers but plunderers; not restorers of the world, but unsatisfiable rakers up of gold... We find that the Detestable Beast of Pride has crept like a serpent up to the chair of Peter (*superbiae detestabilem Bestiam usque ad Sedem Petri reptasse*)" (*Cardinal Baronius, Annales Eccl.*, vol. 19, p. 122). All medieval theologians and saints testify in the same manner: St. Bernard (d. 1153) (*Migne, P.L.* 182, 434), King Louis VII (1160) (*Migne P.L.* 200, 1379), St. Hildegarde (d. 1178) (*Migne P.L.* 197, 1017), Abbot Gilbert of Gemblours (1208) (*Migne P.L.* 211, 1287), Peter of Blois (1192) (*Migne P.L.* 206, 1264), etc. Emperor Frederick II (d. 1250) called the pope: "A Pharisee anointed with the oil of iniquity... who excites the whole world to scandal... He is the Great Dragon (*Draco magnus*) who has seduced the whole world, he is the Antichrist (*Antichristus*)... another Balaam... the head of the princes of darkness... He is the Angel that came out of the Pit (*de Abyss*)... a false Vicar of Christ (*falsus Christi Vicarius*)" (*Peter de Vine, Epistles, Basle, 1740, vol. 1, p. 198*). The same emperor called the Cardinals: "Ye Sons of Belial (*fili Belial*)... Satan, the Prince of discord sits in your midst" (*Baronius, vol. 21, p. 225*).

Pope Boniface VIII (d. 1303) was convicted of murder, sex perversion and atheism by the Council of Paris and by the Roman Catholic council convoked by Pope Clement V. He denied life after death, claimed that religion was a human invention and called Christ a "hypocrite" (*Pierre Dupuy, "Preuves de l'Histoire du differend..." Paris, 1655, p. 541; Bishop Hefele, History of the Councils, bk. 40, art. 697*). When they drove him out of Rome, this pope committed suicide (*Muratori, R.I.S. vol. 13, p. 397*).

Pope John XXII (1316–1327) was called by the Franciscan

monks a "Heretic", the "Antichrist" and the "Dragon with Seven Heads". The Roman Council of 1327 excommunicated the fleeing pope, and as Antichrist he was burned in effigy in front of the St. Peter (*Muratori, R.I.S. vol. 15, p. 80*).

St. Catherine of Siena (d. 1380), an inspired Prophetess (*Breviary, April 30*), calls the Roman hierarchy "Demons of Hell" (*Demoni infernali*), "Venders of divine grace" (*Rivenditori della divina grazia*), "who care for nothing else than pleasures and estates" (*Caterina, "Epistole", Ep. 41, vol. 1*) p. 253).

St. Bridget of Sweden (d. 1373), an inspired Prophetess (*Breviary, Oct. 8*), warns the world that Antichrist is among us, and in a vision God instructed her to tell the pope: "You are truly a murderer of souls . . . you are worse than Lucifer . . . you are more unjust than Pilate . . . you are more cruel than Judas . . . Your (papal) throne shall be thrown down like a heavy stone which does not come to rest until it reaches the lowest depths of Hell" (*Birgitta, "Revelationes" bk 1, chap. 41*).

St. Vincent Ferrer (d. 1419), a canonized Saint, described the Roman hierarchy as follows: "They are vain and arrogant courtiers, lovers of fine living and pompous display, and much given to usury; they make their faith subservient to schemes of worldly wealth and ambition, and entirely neglect the care of their churches; they visit the great ones of the world and the wealthy, but seldom the poor and the lowly; they have neither simplicity, love of God, nor chastity; . . . in short, their entire life is one uninterrupted scandal" (*Alzog II, 909*).

St. Vincent Ferrer and St. Catherine of Siena were contemporary saints, yet they did not support the same pope. Vincent supported Pope Clement VII, Catherine supported Pope Urban VI. From 1378 to 1409, the West had two lines of popes, the Italian residing in Rome and the French

residing at Avignon. When the Council of Pisa (1409) dethroned both popes and elected Pope Alexander V, the older popes, Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, refused to abdicate, with the result that the West had three lines of popes (1409–1415). Pope John XXIII convoked the Council of Constance (1415) which not only dethroned the two anti-popes, but also dethroned Pope John for having raped 200 women. This Ecumenical Council assures us that Pope John was so immoral “that among the faithful of Christ, who knew his life and character, he was publicly called the DEVIL INCARNATE” (*Council of Constance, 1415, Session 10, Art. 8; Mansi 27, 663*).

Catholic scholars, like Alzog and Pastor, fully admit that the popes of the Reformation era were very immoral men. Pope Callistus III (1455–1457) has his immoral life recorded in the text of the Diet of Frankfort (1457). Pope Sixtus IV (1471–1484), an immoral Franciscan monk who lived with his mistress Theresia, made his two illegitimate children Cardinals (*Alzog II, 905*). Pope Innocent VIII (1484–1492) “had a number of natural children” (*Alzog II, 905*). The pope’s son, armed with a sword, roamed the streets of Rome at night with a gang of youths, entering any home and raping any virgin he desired. Pope Alexander VI (1492–1503) had six known illegitimate children. His first mistress was Countess Vanozza de’ Catanei, “who had already been twice married, by whom he had four sons and one daughter” (*Alzog II, 908*). His second mistress, a blond teenager, Giulia, gave him another child. The sex orgies this pope staged in the Vatican I have mentioned in my book “Catholic Victory” (p. 103), but they are too horrible to mention here. Such acts, “in their foulness and extravagance, surpass the bounds of credibility” (*Pastor VI, 129*). Pope Julius II (1503–1513) had three known illegitimate children (*Pastor*). Pope Paul III (1534–1549) had four known illegitimate children. Had he

not been the brother of Giulia, the mistress of Pope Alexander VI, history would never have recorded his name. This pope convoked the Council of Trent (1545) and, like his immoral successor, Pope Julius III, condemned with hundreds of anathemas those who sought reform and wished to restore the Bible as the rule of faith.

Thus by her own records and by her own historians Rome stands condemned as the Mother of Harlots.

## CHAPTER TEN

### THE ROMAN CHURCH

WHAT IS THE OFFICIAL NAME OF THE CHURCH OF ROME? WHAT IS THE MEANING OF THE WORDS "CHURCH", "CATHOLICISM", "ROMANISM", "ECUMENICALISM", ETC.?

The Greek New Testament does not use our word "church" (*Kuriakon*, i.e. a building) but uses 115 times "Ekklesia", an *assembly, congregation*, i.e. a group of people. The Latins of Southern Europe left this Greek word untranslated: *Ecclesia*, *Iglesia*, *Eglise*, but the pagans of Northern Europe continued to use the pagan Teutonic word: *Church*, *Kirche*, *Kirk*, *Kerk*. Our word "church" is of Mithraistic origin, and is derived from the non-biblical Greek word: *Kuriakon*, House of the Lord, House of Mithra (*Migne P.G.* 33, 1047). The English word "church" can now refer to both people and a building. In Latin the people are called *Ecclesia*, and the building *Basilica*.

In the Bible, the official name of the church is "Ekklesia". This official name never has an adjective like *holy church*, *apostolic church*, *catholic church*, etc. Neither the adjective "Roman" nor the adjective "Catholic" can be found in the text of the New Testament. The oldest name for the church

in the city of Rome is "The Church of God which resides at Rome". This city-church soon came to be known as the "Roman Church" (*Ecclesia Romana*). The word "Roman", like the words *Alexandrian*, *Carthaginian*, *Constantinopolitan*, *Antiochean*, *Corinthian*, etc., refers to a city, not to an empire (*Mansi* 2, 607). As Christ could not have named His church after a pagan, Western European town, it is clear that the Roman Church is not the universal church.

In the beginning of the 4th century Emperor Constantine (d. 337) merged all Christian churches into one, visible, international or ecumenical church. He convoked the first Catholic Council in 325 and appointed the Spanish Bishop, Hosius, as its first Catholic President. This first Ecumenical Council condemned Arianism (denial of the divinity of Christ). The Church of Rome, Italy, for example, joined the Catholic Church; the Church of Milan, Italy, refused to join it and remained Arian. The 4th-century word "Catholic" no longer means *universal*, but *non-Arian*, or *Trinitarian*. The 4th century not only speaks of the "Catholic Church", but of "Catholic bishops", "Catholic faith", etc. The same century gave us the Nicene Creed which placed four adjectives before the word church: "I believe in . . . one, holy, catholic and apostolic church". In the 7th century the word "Catholic" was added to the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in . . . the holy (Catholic) church." After the Reformation a new creed added the word "Roman": "I acknowledge . . . the holy, catholic and apostolic Roman Church" (*Mansi* 33, 220 B).

As long as Rome was a member of the Ecumenical or Catholic Church (325–1054) it called itself the "Roman Church". In 1054 the Catholic Church split in two halves: East and West, or Greek and Latin. As neither half could claim to be the whole church, the East began to call itself the Greek Orthodox Church, the West called itself the "Roman Catholic Church" (*Romana Universalis Ecclesia*;

*Monumenta Germ. Hist., Leges, Section 4, vol. 1, p. 539*). Officially, however, the Roman bishops continued to call their church the "Roman Church", usually preceded by the adjective *holy*: sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia. After the Reformation the Protestants referred to the papal church as the Roman Catholic Church in order to distinguish it from the Greek Catholic Church, Syrian Catholic Church, Coptic Catholic Church, Polish Catholic Church, etc. In the 19th century the Roman church in Italy and the United States began to drop the word "Roman", claiming that the Protestants use the word in a derogatory manner, and it began to identify itself as the only true "Catholic Church".

That the word "Roman" or "Romish" is not of Protestant origin is clear in other languages. Catholic France calls its church "Catholique-Romain" (Roman Catholic). The Catholics of Holland call their church: "De Roomsche Katholieke Kerk" (The Romish Catholic Church). When the German Catholics abbreviate the name of their church, they do not drop the word *Romish*, but the word *Catholic*: "Roomsche Kerk", "Römische Kirche". American priests always speak of the *Roman* Ritual, *Roman* Missal, *Roman* collar, etc. The Roman Missal nowhere uses the word "Catholic". The Roman Missal contains the papal Bull "Quo primum" which speaks only of the "Roman Church". The Mass for the election of a pope speaks of the pontiff of the "Roman Church".

When the pre-ecumenical Pope Cornelius (d. 253) spoke of "the whole Roman Church" (*Ecclesia omnis Romana*; *Migne, P.L. 3, 857*) he did not mean all Christians in the world, but all those within the city limits of Rome. When the Ecumenical Councils spoke of the Roman Church (*Romana Ecclesia*; *Mansi 11, 947*), they referred to the church in the city of Rome. The popes of the Middle Ages continued to call their church the "Roman Church" (*Migne, P.L. 214, 985 & 1030*). The pre-reformation Protestant, John Wycliff



(d. 1384) made it clear that "It is an error if one understands by the Roman Church the church universal" (*Mansi* 27, 634). When Roman Catholic scholars of today speak of the "Roman Church" they do not mean "the whole church" (*C.E.* 4, 312). Yet the U.S. Library of Congress designates the Roman Church as the official "Catholic Church".

## CHAPTER ELEVEN

### POPES AND PONTIFFS

#### WHAT IS THE ORIGIN AND MEANING OF THE WORDS "POPE" AND "PONTIFF"?

The bishop of Rome was never called a 'Catholic Pope', but always a "Roman Pope" (*Papa Romanus*; Migne, P.L. 141, 1132), because other Western cities also had popes. The Church of Rome respectfully addressed St. Cyprian (d. 258), the Head of the Carthaginian Church, as "Pope Cyprian" (*Cypriano Papae*; Migne, P.L. 4, 275 & 311; Mansi 1, 801), although Cyprian himself never used the title. St. Jerome (d. 420), living at Rome, called the non-Roman bishop, Theophilus: "Pope Theophilus" (Migne, P.L. 22, 755).

Roman Catholics call God "Our Father", and call their pope "Our Holy Father", in spite of Christ's warning in Matthew (23:9). They are often told that the word "pope" (*papa*) means *father* (Latin word for 'father' is *pater*). The word "Papa" or "Pope" is of pagan origin. The pagan priests of Rome were called "Father" (*pater*) and the Chief priest was called "Father of fathers" (*pater patrum*), or Chief father (*Pater Patratus populi Romani*; Livy, *Hist. of Rome*, bk 1, *chapt.* 24). The *Pater Patratus* (abbreviated: Pa.Pa.) wore a

toga, a girdle, a miter and ring, like the 'christian' popes of today. Modern popes still sign their names with the strange abbreviation, "P.P.", e.g. "Pius P.P. XII". The word 'pope' (papa) is a contraction of two words. When the West in the 3rd century began to use the Latin word "papa" as a translation of the Greek word "bishop" the African churches hesitated to use this title, not only because it was Mithraistic, but it implied some form of hierarchy (father of fathers; bishop of bishops; primacy) which was considered heretical (*Migne, P.L.* 2, 1032; 3, 1092; 4, 432). When Mithraism was outlawed and Christianity was made the State religion (4th cent.), the primates of the Western churches called themselves popes until Pope Hildebrand (11th cent.) united the West into a Roman Catholic Church and claimed the sole right to the title "pope".

"With the triumph of Christianity, Mithraism came to a sudden end. . . The chief of the fathers, a sort of pope, who always lived at Rome, was called 'Pater Patrum' or 'Pater Patratus'" (*C.E.* 10, 402—403). "As late as the seventh century St. Gall (d. 640) addresses Desiderius of Cahors as *papa* (*Migne, P.L.* 87, 265). Gregory VII finally prescribed that it should be confined to the successors of Peter" (*C.E.* 12, 270).

Before 1054 the word *pope* was synonymous with archbishop; after 1054 it denotes the Head of the Western Church. Hence it is historically correct to call the early bishops of Rome "popes", though the papacy originated in the 11th century.

## PONTIFFS

The word "pontifex" (pontiff; from *pons*, *pontis*, bridge, and *facere*, to build) means 'bridge-builder' and was the title of certain Mithraistic priests. The emperor, as defender of the faith, had the title of Supreme Pontiff. The pagan Pontiff

of Rome annually sacrificed to the river gods twenty-four victims who were thrown from the sacred Sublician bridge into the Tiber. "During imperial times the emperor was the highpriest (*pontifex maximus*)" (*C.E.* 12, 410). Emperor Constantine (d. 337) held the pagan title of *Pontifex Maximus*, and when he was converted to Christianity he made himself Supreme Pontiff of the Christian Church. The Eastern emperors kept this title till the schism between East and West. Western Primates who were independent from the East, used this title long before the bishop of Rome. Since the 12th century only the Roman bishop is called the Supreme Pontiff of the West.

Third-century Africa used *pontiff* as the Latin equivalent of the Greek word: *bishop* (*Migne, P.L.* 3, 1548), but the title of *Supreme Pontiff* remained heretical till the conversion of Constantine. Bishop Tertullian once called an arrogant bishop of Rome (Callistus) by the pagan title of Supreme Pontiff (*Migne, P.L.* 2, 1032), because this title was so hated by the persecuted Christians. He had no idea that 800 years later the Roman bishops would claim that title for themselves alone. The African Council of 419, presided over by "Pope Aurelius", forbade any bishop to call himself "Supreme Bishop" (*Summus Sacerdos*; *canon* 39); and Pope Gregory I objected to the title of "Universal Bishop". The non-ecumenical bishops of the West used the title of Supreme Pontiff to indicate their independence. The Primate of England kept the title till the 12th century.

"As regards the title *Pontifex Maximus*...there was further a reminiscence of the dignity attached to that title in pagan Rome. Tertullian...uses the phrase of Pope Callistus. Though his words are ironical...Hilary of Arles (d. 449) is so styled by Eucherius of Lyons (*Migne, P.L.* 50, 773), and Lanfranc is termed 'Primas et Pontifex Summus' by his biographer, Milo Crispin (*Migne, P.L.* 110, 10)... After the

eleventh century it appears to be only used of the popes" (C.E. 12, 270).

The Roman Church itself, therefore, admits that the words "Pope" and "Supreme Pontiff" are both of pagan origin and did not become the official titles of the Bishop of Rome until after the final schism (1054) when Pope Hildebrand assumed universal dictatorship (*"Dictatus Papae"*).

## CHAPTER TWELVE

### TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES

*WHEN AND HOW DID THE POPES RECEIVE TEMPORAL POWERS? WHEN DID THE TIARA AND THE CUSTOM OF KISSING THE POPE'S FEET ORIGINATE?*

The bishop of Rome became a king or temporal ruler of the Papal States in 752 and began to wear a headgear known as a *camelaucum*. Any Christian ought to be suspicious of a man of the Gospel who uses his ministry to obtain worldly power, for Christ warns: "My kingdom is not of this world" (*John 18:36*). The Papal States were obtained by forgery, fraud, theft and murder.

There was in Italy a large, non-Catholic denomination, known as the Lombards (Arian or Unitarian) to whom the pope refers as "the most stinking race of Lombards, a race which by no means can be considered human, and from which the disease of leprosy originated" (*Migne, P.L. 89, 1254*). In order to destroy this religious group and to confiscate their land, Pope Stephen fabricated two forgeries: "The Acts of Sylvester" and the "Constitution of Sylvester" which claimed that Emperor Constantine (d. 337) had given this land to Pope Sylvester. In 752 Pope Stephen III consented to crown the Frankish king, Pepin, and by means of

these documents convinced this barbarian to come with his army to Italy and drive the Lombards out. Thus by force, intrigue, theft and blood the Papal States came into existence and the pope became a king.

When the armies of Pepin left Italy, the Lombards returned, reoccupied their land and warred against the pope. Then Pope Stephen fabricated another forgery, this time under the name of St. Peter himself, and mailed it to Pepin: "Ego Apostolus Dei Petrus: I, Peter, the Apostle of God... protest and admonish... and under firm obligation conjure you (*firma obligatione conjuro*)... to save the beloved city of Rome from the detested Lombards (*Migne, P.L. 89, 1005; Baronius, "Annales", 755 A.D.; vol. 12, p. 601*). Flattered by this celestial appeal, and fearing the apostolic curse, the ignorant king once more came to Rome, and after a great blood bath, once more handed the stolen property to the pope.

Pope Adrian (d. 795) fabricated the "Donation of Constantine", which greatly deceived Charlemagne, King of the Franks, and which forgery led to the coronation of Charlemagne as 'Roman' Emperor (A.D. 800) and to the recognition of Pope Leo III as the first spiritual leader of this new empire (Italy, Germany and France).

"Donation of Constantine... a forged document of Emperor Constantine the Great, by which large privileges and rich possessions were conferred on the Pope and the Roman Church. ... This document is without doubt a forgery, fabricated somewhere between the years 750 and 850" (*C.E. 5, 118-119*).

Pope Sylvester II (d. 1003) knew that this document was a forgery (*C.E. 14, 371*), but Pope Leo IX (1054) rewrote it in order to proclaim himself the head of all churches on earth. "This document was never used... until... Leo IX in 1054" (*C.E. 5, 119*).

Because of these medieval forgeries the popes of today are rulers of a sovereign State which may print its own money and stamps, while the Italian peasants must pay millions as restitution for the Papal States of the Middle Ages.

Because the "Donation" is a 'spurious' forgery, there is no original text. The present text portrays Emperor Constantine relinquishing his own crown to hand it to the pope: "We convey... the diadem (diadema), that is, the crown (coronam) which We grant from our own head" (*Mansi* 2, 610). The same forgery grants the pope the right to wear the imperial "stole" (superhumeralem) and "miter" (mitram). As the popes did not wear miters till the 11th century (*C.E.* 10, 405), this part of the Donation came also from the hand of Pope Leo IX (1049).

The early bishops of Rome (54—752) wore no headgear of any kind. As kings of the Papal States they wore a tight fitting cap or helmet. When the final Schism became evident in 1049 the independent primates of both East and West began to wear miters and rings as Supreme Pontiffs of their national churches. The popes merely followed the customs of their times. They did not wear a ring till the 13th century (see *C.E.* 13, 60).

The early crowns and miters were cone-shaped and very much alike. Pope Boniface VIII (1300), a convicted murderer, atheist and sex pervert (*Pierre Dupuy, Preuves de l'Histoire; Paris, 1655, p. 541*), invented a double crown for the papacy. Pope John XXII (1316), whose mistress was Countess de Talleyrand-Perigord and who was burned in effigy as Antichrist in front of the St. Peter, invented the triple crown. Pope Julius II (d. 1513), who had three known illegitimate children (*Pastor, vol. 5, p. 369*), "had a tiara valued at 200,000 ducats" (*C.E.* 14, 715). The triple tiara is valued today at \$3,000,000.00. The only real crown mentioned in the N.T. Scriptures is one of thorns, worn by



Christ. His alleged 'Vicar' does not seem to believe that His kingdom is not of this world.

From the 13th century till this day all subjects of the pope must kiss his foot. Laymen kiss the foot alone, bishops the foot and knee, cardinals kiss the foot and hand, kings kiss the hand only. "The kissing of the pope's foot," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, is "the characteristic act of reverence by which all the faithful do honour to him as the vicar of Christ" (*C.E.* 12, 270).

Christ did not demand such worship for Himself, but washed the feet of His disciples. Peter, supposedly His first Vicar, explicitly forbade this act of worship (*Acts* 10:26). The pope, who claims to have inherited the succession and vicariate of both, certainly did not inherit their humility. Webster's Dictionary defines a *vicar* as a "*substitute*". Those who blindly follow a pope as a substitute for Christ ought to be called Papists instead of Christians.

## CHAPTER THIRTEEN

### "THE ROCK"

*DOES THE "ROCK" (Matth. 16:18) REFER TO CHRIST,  
OR TO PETER AND THE POPE?*

The Bible says that the Rock is Christ (*I Cor. 10:4*); Peter himself says that it refers to Christ (*I Peter 2:6*); Paul says it refers to Christ (*Rom. 9:33*). The Old Testament uses it in this sense (*Isa. 28:16*). The Fathers explained the petrine text as referring to Christ. The popes of the first thousand years explained this text in the same manner. Not until the rise of Roman Catholicism (1054) did the Western theologians begin to explain Matthew 16:18 as referring to the pope and to his primacy.

Peter was the first one to confess his faith in Christ, and salvation is by faith alone. Therefore Christ said to Peter: "You are Peter (petros), and on this Rock (petra) I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it" (Matth. 16:18). Christ did not say: 'and *on you* I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail *against you*', but He said: 'against *it*', i.e. against the Rock (petra), i.e. against Christ, for "the Rock was Christ" (*I Cor. 10:4*).

Both Peter and Paul explain that the petrine text refers to

the fulfillment of the prophecy of Isaiah: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a Stone, a tried Stone, a precious Corner Stone, a sure Foundation: he that believeth shall not be confounded" (*Isa. 28:16*). Salvation is not by faith in a man (*petros*), but by faith in God (*petra*). Both Peter and Paul explain Isaiah: "whosoever believeth on HIM (the Rock) shall not be confounded" (*I Peter 2:6; Rom. 9:3*). Peter did not introduce himself to the Jews as a means of salvation, but he introduced Christ: "This is the Stone which ye rejected. . . Neither is there salvation in any other" (*Acts 4:8-12*). Paul explains that the faithful are the church, and Christ its foundation: "Ye are the Building of God. . . For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ" (*I Cor. 3:9-11*). "And that Rock was Christ" (*I Cor. 10:4*). Peter once more explains the petrine text by saying that all believers are "like living stones", "a spiritual House", and "precious" (*I Peter 2:1-10*).

Hence the foundation was laid in Zion, Palestine; not in Rome, Italy (*Luke 24:47; Acts 1:4; 8:1*). The foundation is Christ, not Peter (*I Cor. 3:11*). The Rock is Christ, not Peter (*I Cor. 10:4; Acts 4:11*). The sure Foundation in which the sinner must believe is Christ, not Peter (*I Peter 2:6; Rom. 9:33, 10:11; Acts 13:39; I John 5:1*).

The biblical word "church" (*ekklesia*) is synonymous with the faithful, the believers, the saved, the elect, the saints, the Christians (*I Cor. 1:2; Eph. 1:1*). It denotes people, never a building. One cannot "build" *people*. Hence the petrine text is a metaphor, a symbolism, a figure of speech. Salvation is by faith and in Christ alone. Christ is the foundation of the believer. Peter was the first to confess that faith in Christ and became the first living stone of faith to be placed on the Rock. Therefore Christ said to Peter: Thou art a stone (*petros*), and pointing at Himself He said: And on this Rock (*petra*) I will build and support My followers, the believers,

the church. All believers are God's building (*I Cor.* 3:9). All disciples, not Peter alone, are built on the Rock, which is Christ (*I Cor.* 10:4). All believers, "as living stones" are "built on the foundation of the apostles" (*Eph.* 2:20), all supporting one another, and Christ supporting all, being both the rock-foundation and the chief cornerstone. Thus the Bible interprets itself; thus it was interpreted by the Fathers.

The Fathers differed in terminology, but not in thought. Generally speaking, the South (Egypt and Africa) explained that Peter, as the first fruit of faith, represents all believers on whom the church is founded. The East explained that the church was founded on faith in Christ, which Peter was privileged to confess first. The West explained that the Church is founded on Christ in whom it confesses its faith. No Father ever taught the church was founded on Peter alone, on one man alone, or on the bishop of Rome.

Origen (d. 254) was the first Father to write a complete commentary on the Bible. He was from Alexandria, Egypt, and explained Matthew 16:18 as follows: "If you suppose that on this Peter alone the whole church is built by God, what would you say about John, the son of Thunder, or about any other of the apostles? Is it at all possible to say that against Peter in particular the gates of Hell shall not prevail, but that they shall prevail against the other apostles and against the elect? . . . Let us consider in what sense it is said to Peter and to every 'peter' (believer): 'I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom' . . . Consider how great a power the Rock has . . . and how great a power every one has who says: 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God' . . ." (*Migne, P.G.* 13, 999 & 1011-1015).

St. Athanasius (d. 373), Patriarch of Alexandria, writes: "You are blessed who are in the church by faith, and who dwell on the foundations of faith . . . For this is what is

written: "Thou art the son of the living God", which Peter confessed by revelation of the Father . . . No one, therefore, will ever prevail against your faith, most beloved brethren" (*Migne, P.G.* 26, 1189–1190).

St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), Patriarch of Constantinople, the greatest of all Fathers (18 volumes in *Migne*), the "golden-mouthed" Greek orator and interpreter of the entire Bible, explains that Christ did not say: "epi toi petroi" (upon this stone or upon this Peter), but "epi tautei tei petrai" (upon this Rock) I will build my church. "Petros" is a stone or brick which can be handled, "Petra" is a rock foundation like Gibraltar. The two words differ in meaning and in gender: *petros* is masculine, *petra* is feminine. Let no Latin theologian bluff you into believing that he knows better Greek than Chrysostom, and that the *petros-petra* argument is an old wives' tale. Chrysostom explains: "Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my church", which means, upon the faith of his confession" (*Migne, P.G.* 58, 534). "'Upon this Rock (petram)': He did not say 'upon Peter (petrum)', nor upon a man, but upon his faith (fidem) He has built his Church" (*Migne, P.G.* 52, 806).

St. Ambrose (d. 397), an independent Italian bishop, followed Origen's interpretation of the Rock: "Peter is an everlasting door against whom the gates of Hell shall not prevail; John and James, the sons of Thunder, are everlasting doors; everlasting are the doors of the Church (all believers)" (*Migne, P.L.* 16, 647). "They do not possess the inheritance of Peter, who do not possess the faith\*" of Peter" (*Migne, P.L.* 16, 496).

St. Jerome (d. 420), official Bible translator and interpreter of the Church of Rome, writes in his commentary on Matthew: "Thou art Peter (Petrus) and upon this Rock

---

\*) One MS mistook *fidem* for *sedem* and reads: 'chair of Peter'. Whether faith or chair, St. Ambrose claimed he possessed it.

(Petram) I will build my church' . . . To Simon, who believed in the Rock (Petra), that is, Christ, the name of Peter (Petrus) was given" (*Migne, P.L. 26, 121*). "The Rock is Christ, who granted to His apostles that they too should be called 'rocks' " (*Migne, P.L. 25, 1066*). "The Church is founded . . . upon all the apostles . . . and the strength of the Church is established upon them all equally (et ex aequo super eos Ecclesiae fortitudo solidetur)" (*Migne, P.L. 23, 258*). St. Jerome was hired and paid by Pope Damasus to write these lines which deny that the church is built on Peter and his successors alone.

St. Augustine (d. 430), Bishop of Africa, the greatest of the Latin Fathers: "Upon this Rock I will build my church: . . . But in order that the Church might be built upon a Rock, who was made the Rock? Listen to Paul who explains: 'For the Rock was Christ' (I Cor. 10:4). On Him, therefore, we (the church) have been built" (*Migne, P.L. 36, 724*). "Now considering that Christ is the Rock (Petra) . . . Therefore He said: 'Thou art Peter and upon this Rock, which thou hast confessed . . . that is, upon Myself who am the Son of the living God, I will build my church. I will build you upon Me, not Me on you'. The church is not built on men but on Christ. Those who wished to be built upon men, said: I am of Paul, I am of Appolos, and I am of Cephas who is Peter (I Cor. 3:4-23). But others who did not wish to be built upon Peter, but upon the Rock, said: I am of Christ" (*Migne, P.L. 38, 1239*).

"'Upon this Rock I will build my church': Not upon Peter (petrum) which you are, but upon the Rock (petram) which you have confessed" (*Migne, P.L. 38, 1239*). "The Rock upon which the Church is built is Christ Himself . . . Upon this Rock I will build the faith which thou hast confessed . . . It was not one man that received these keys, but the unity of the church (believers)" (*Migne, P.L. 38, 1349*). "In this manner I have most frequently explained what the Lord

said: 'Thou are Peter' and 'upon this Rock'...should be understood as upon Him whom Peter confessed...For Christ was the Rock whom Simon confessed, even as the whole church confesses Him" (*Migne, P.L. 32, 618*).

The petrine text: "Tu es Petrus et super hanc petram..." is painted in huge letters in the St. Peter's Church at Rome. On this text rests the Roman claim that Christ founded the Roman Catholic Church and made Peter the first pope. The papal throne, the alleged 'chair of Peter', is supported by the statues of the four greatest patriarchs of the 4th century: Chrysostom, Ambrose, Athanasius and Augustine, representing Eastern Europe, Western Europe, Egypt and Africa. As we have seen, not one of these four Saints taught that the petrine text referred to the bishop of Rome; not one belonged to the Roman Church, while all four condemned the making of statues.

We need not examine the Greek Fathers, like St. Cyril (d. 444; *Migne, P.G. 75, 866*), Blessed Theodoret (d. 457; *Migne, P.G. 83, 1366*), etc., to find the late Western interpretation of the petrine text. Therefore, we shall briefly examine the most important of the Latin Fathers.

Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) explained the petrine text at Rome as follows: "The solidity of that FAITH, which was praised in the chief of apostles, is continual...for throughout the church 'peter' (the believer) daily says: 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God'...This faith conquers the Devil and loosens the bonds of the captives. It (this faith) lifts us from this earth and plants us in heaven, and the gates of Hell cannot prevail against it (our faith)" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 144-146*). "This confession (of faith) shall not be conquered by the gates of Hell, the bonds of death shall not bind it" (*P.L. 54, 150-151*). "Whereas I Myself am the Inviolable Rock, whereas I am the chief Corner Stone . . . , whereas I am the Foundation against which no one can prevail, yet thou

(the believer) also art a 'rock', because thou hast been solidified by My power" (*P.L.* 54, 150). "For He (Christ) wished him (the confessor of faith) who had been received into His undivided unity, to be *named* what He Himself *was*" (*P.L.* 54 629). "A chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession, built upon the impregnable Rock, Christ" (*P.L.* 54, 207).

Pope Leo, following St. Augustine, explained to Emperor Leo that it is this confession of faith by the believer "on which the City of God is built" (*P.L.* 54, 1143). By official Canon Law Pope Leo decreed that the interpretation of the petrine text is as follows: "He promised that the gates of Hell shall never prevail against this confession of the blessed apostle Peter" (*Pope Leo, canon 48, chapt. 4; Migne, P.L.* 56, 633).

Pope Gelasius (d. 496) taught likewise, "that the gates of Hell shall never prevail against the confession of the blessed apostle Peter" (*Migne, P.L.* 59, 14).

Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604) who explained that Christ is "our Head" (*Migne, P.L.* 77, 1028) and that any human dictator "is the forerunner of Antichrist" (*P.L.* 77, 891), writes: "Peter . . . Paul, Andrew, John, what were they but Heads of particular communities. And yet they all were members under One Head (Christ)" (*P.L.* 77, 740). "Whosoever then . . . firmly holds the FAITH . . . he has laid as a foundation the same Jesus Christ, the Son of God" (*P.L.* 77, 980).

St. Bede (d. 735), British "Doctor" and Bible interpreter, explains this text: "'Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my church'. He speaks to him metaphorically: 'upon this Rock', which means: upon the SAVIOUR whom thou hast confessed, the Church will be built" (*Bede, Comment. on Matthew; Migne, P.L.* 92, 78-79).

At the Seventh Ecumenical Council (787 A.D.), Tarasius,



Patriarch of Constantinople, explained the petrine text: "The Church . . . has been founded upon the Rock, namely, upon Christ our God" (*II Council of Nice, 787, Session 1; Mansi 12, 1005*). In the second session of the same council we find that Pope Adrian wrote that the apostle Peter "was thought worthy to confess that FAITH upon which the Church of Christ is founded (*promeruit confeteri fidem, supra quam fundatur Ecclesia Christi*)" (*Mansi 12, 1057; Migne, P.L. 96, 1220*). Both interpretations were considered in agreement and adopted without objection. We notice that the Pope does not speak of his local Church of Rome, but of the Church of Christ. He further makes it plain that the church is not founded on a human being (*quem*), but on faith (*quam*).

Because the petrine text is a metaphor, there must have been some people who misunderstood it; but recognized Bible interpreters, like the ninth-century Abbot, Paschasius Radbertus, explained it correctly: "Because thou art Peter", which name is derived from Petra, that is, derived from Me upon whom the whole church is built. For Peter, as some falsely believe, is not the foundation of the whole church, because 'no one can lay another foundation than that is laid, which is Christ Jesus'" (*Paschasius, Comment. on Matthew; Migne, P.L. 120, 560*).

Rabanus Maurus (856), Archbishop of Mainz, Primate of Germany and leading theologian of the ninth-century Holy Roman Empire, wrote a Commentary on Matthew: "'Thou art Peter and upon this Rock . . . ' For the Rock was Christ. And upon this Rock, that is, upon the Lord Saviour . . . the church is built, because without faith . . . one cannot attain the inheritance of the Elect and eternal life, as the Apostle attests when he says: 'For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ'" (*Migne P.L. 107, 991*).

In the 10th century the Council of Trosly (909) defined: "The Church . . . has been built upon the Rock, that is, upon the confession of Peter" (*canon 15; Mansi 17A, 305*).

Of all the commentaries on Matthew 16:18, written during the first thousand years of christianity, not one mentions the "papacy" (the Fathers would not know how to spell the word); not one mentions the "primacy" of the bishop of Rome. Such an idea and interpretation did not even exist as a heresy.

Pope Leo IX, the pope of the final schism (1054 A.D.), is the first Roman bishop to dispute the meaning of the petrine text with the Patriarch of Constantinople (*Migne, P.L. 143, 774*). By rewriting the old forgery, the Donation of Constantine, he gave himself the title of "Vicar of the Son of God", a title based on the petrine text and representing the number "666" (*Migne, P.L. 130, 248; 143, 753; Mansi 2, 607; Labbe 1, 1534; C.E. 5, 118*).

Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII) in 1073 became the first Roman bishop to openly declare himself the head of the entire world by his papal Bull, known as the "Dictatus Papae", which decreed: "(1) That the Roman Church was founded by God alone. (2) That the Roman Pontiff alone is to be called 'Universal'. (3) That he alone has the power to depose and reconcile bishops . . . That all princes should kiss his feet, and his alone . . ." etc. (*Mirbt, No. 278; Kidd, vol. 3, p. 129*). Bishop Anselm (d. 1086), nephew of Pope Alexander, immediately incorporated these new decrees into his Collection of Canon Laws, which since have been mutilated. Canon 10 decrees: "That upon one, that is, upon Peter the Lord God has built His church." Canon 3: "That blessed Peter has handed down the power invested in himself to his successors" (*Migne, P.L. 149, 485-487*). Thus, in the 149th volume of Migne's Latin Fathers we find in a dubious collection the first interpretation on which Roman Catholicism

is founded. It took us more than 1,000 years and more than 148 huge volumes of Latin works to find this first interpretation by a man (Hildebrand) who was the first bishop to usurp the sole title of "Pope" and "Supreme Pontiff".

After the Schism (1054) the East continued to interpret the petrine text as it had done for 1,000 years (*Migne, P.G.* 123, 319). As long as England remained independent it continued the old interpretation (*St. Anselm, d. 1109, Migne, P.L.* 158, 637 & 714; *Peter of Blois, c. 1203, Migne, P.L.* 207, 644). Even a few independent theologians like St. Bruno (12th cent.) continued the traditional explanation (*Migne, P.L.* 165, 213). Pope Innocent III (1215) wrote a book "On the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff", and interpreted his dictatorial powers: "Peter can bind the others, but cannot be bound by the others" (*Migne, P.L.* 217, 778). For the next 150 years the West was afraid to oppose this new interpretation until John Wycliff (d. 1384) exposed the papal fraud and set the stage for the reformation (*Mansi* 27, 634).

Today, the Roman Catholic Church holds that "The Pope, the Bishop of Rome, is the visible Head of the Church because he is the successor of St. Peter, whom Christ made the chief of the Apostles... when He said: 'Thou art Peter (a rock) and upon this rock I will build My Church'" (*Baltimore Catechism, No. 3, Buffalo, 1933, p. 59*). The Greek Orthodox still teaches: "The Church has no visible head, but only the Invisible One, Christ Himself" (*Bishop Athenagoras Kokkinakis, "Christian Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism", Los Angeles, 1952*). "It is quite evident from these words of our Lord that He built His church not upon Peter, for then He would have clearly said: Thou art Peter and upon thee I will build My church; but upon the rock of the true faith which Peter confessed" (*Archbishop Michael, "Schism", p. 6*).

## CHAPTER FOURTEEN

### PAPAL SUPREMACY

#### *IS THE PRIMACY OF THE BISHOP OF ROME AN ANCIENT DOCTRINE?*

According to foot notes in the Catholic Bible, the Church of Jerusalem was founded in 33 A.D., the first gentile Church of Antioch was founded in 42 A.D., and the Church of Rome much later. We have already mentioned that the Fathers and early popes held that James was the first bishop of the church (33—62 A.D.), and that Peter was Bishop of Antioch for seven years (42—49 A.D.). The feastday of "James the brother of the Lord" is celebrated on May 1st, and the Roman Ritual says that "after the ascension of Christ, the Apostles made him the Bishop of Jerusalem" (*Breviary, May 1*). This sentence has no meaning unless one understands that the other apostles were not bishops of Jerusalem, though it was the only bishopric for nine years. The feastday of the "Chair of St. Peter at Antioch" is celebrated on February 22 (*Missal, Feb. 22*), the feast of the "Chair of St. Peter at Rome" is a late, post-Reformation invention, celebrated on Jan. 18th. Peter became bishop nine years after James. For that reason the Ritual says of St. Ignatius

of Antioch: "Ignatius, after the apostle Peter, the third bishop of the Antiochenian Church" (*Breviary, Feb. 1; C.E.* 7, 644).

If Christ had founded a papacy and intended Peter to be the first Pope, He would have made Peter the first bishop of His church at Jerusalem. If Peter was the first pope and if only his successors were infallible, then it follows that the Syrian Catholic Church is the only true church and that the present Orthodox Bishop of Antioch, Patriarch Theodosios, through an unbroken line of successions, inherited Peter's infallibility. Neither St. Ignatius, nor the Syrian Church ever claimed supremacy.

Roman Catholic scholars are forced to admit that from 33 to 42 A.D. James was a bishop, Peter not; that from 42 to 49 A.D. Peter for the first time became bishop of a minor church while James was bishop of the Mother Church of Jerusalem; that in 49 A.D. Peter ceased to be bishop of Antioch, while James continued as Bishop of Jerusalem; as Rome had no church during the first half of the first century (see Duchesne), Peter either died in 49 A.D. or became unemployed.

Peter was the first among the apostles during Jesus' public life, but did not receive a primacy, nor was he ordained a pope. Not one of the apostles understood the petrine text to mean that Peter had become their master (*Matt. 18:1*). In Matthew 18:18 Christ explains for a second time that the keys were given to all and that no one holds a primacy. John and James had never heard of Peter's primacy (*Matt. 20:21*), and Christ explained for a third time that the church has no primacy (*Matt. 18:4; 19:30; 20:26*). "For one is your Master, Christ; and all ye are brethren (subordinate equals)" (*Matt. 23:8*). Peter never claimed any primacy (*II Peter 1:1*), nor acted as a primate (*I Peter 5:1*).

Paul did not regard Peter as his master, "not even for an

hour" (*Gal.* 2:5 & 12). If the early church had an apostolic leader, one that could be called "*the*" apostle, it was Paul. He travelled all over the earth. He wrote to all the churches. His biblical writings outnumber those of Peter more than ten to one. Paul ordered that presbyters be ordained "in every city" (*Titus* 1:5). Paul gives orders and the churches obey (*I Cor.* 16:1; *II Thes.* 3:6; 3:14). Paul promulgates the first canon laws on prophesy, on the Lord's Supper, on heresy, on mixed marriages, etc., and his laws become commands "for all the churches" (*omnibus ecclesiis*) (*I Cor.* 7:17). If the church had a leader from 49 to 67 A.D., it was Paul, not Peter.

The idea of a primacy, a bishop of bishops, was pagan. Early christianity was democratic. St. Cyprian (d. 258), whom the Roman church addressed as "pope", whom St. Jerome calls "a genius, since his works are more brilliant than the sun", and whom the modern Roman Missal singles out as the only non-Italian Saint worthy to be listed in the Communicantes of the Mass, explains that christianity is not a dictatorship: "For neither does anyone of us set himself up as a 'Bishop of bishops' (*episcopum episcoporum*), nor does anyone by totalitarian methods compel his fellow-bishops to the necessity of obedience" (*Migne, P.L.* 3, 1092; *Mansi I*, 951). "For neither did Peter... arrogantly assume anything to himself, so as to say that he held a primacy (*primatum tenere*)" (*Migne, P.L.* 4, 423). "Certainly the other apostles were also what Peter was, endowed with a like partnership, both of honor and power (*pari consortio et honoris et potestatis*)" (*Migne, P.L.* 4, 515).

During the first 300 years Christianity was illegal and had no central administration. At first, when a national church was plagued by an internal strife and was unable to settle the argument, the parties often agreed to let a neutral church decide the issue. Since the days of Cyprian the pre-ecumen-

ical councils of Africa served as a guide for all national churches. The African councils ruled that all clergy were to abide by the decision of their own national council and may not have recourse to a foreign church. When the Spanish Church in 257 excommunicated Bishop Basilides and appointed Bishop Felix, Basilides appealed to Pope Stephen who reinstated him. But Felix took his case to Cyprian who called a council which overruled Pope Stephen (*Migne, P.L.* 3, 1057). *Africa locuta, res finita.*

The Ecumenical Church in its first two councils (325 & 381) adopted the African rule and decreed that the boundaries and jurisdiction of the ancient sees should remain unchanged (*Nice, canon 6; Mansi 2, 670*), and that one national church cannot reinstate a bishop excommunicated by another national church (*Constantinople, canon 2; Mansi 2, 670*).

St. John Chrysostom (d. 407), the greatest of the Fathers, denied that the Church Universal has a visible Head. "St. John Chrysostom," comically comments the Catholic Encyclopedia, "seems to ignore . . . primacy of the pope" (*C.E.* 8, 457). How one Father, in 18 huge volumes, can ignore the existence of the Roman Papacy, the subjection to which is allegedly essential to salvation, is difficult to understand. But how all Fathers of one thousand years in 300 huge volumes can ignore the existence of an alleged Roman Primacy is obviously impossible. Yet the Catholic Encyclopedia has some explanation: "One need not expect to find in the early centuries a formal and explicit recognition throughout the Church either of the primacy or of the infallibility of the pope" (*C.E.* 7, 797).

When Pope Zosimus (418) tried to interfere with the jurisdiction of the African Church by falsifying the text of the 5th canon of the First Ecumenical Council, both St. Augustine and Bishop Aurelius in the African Council of 419

warned Pope Zosimus (and later Pope Celestine) not to falsify the documents of the Catholic Church, nor to "introduce the empty pride of the world into the Church of Christ," and to keep their Roman noses out of African affairs (*African Council*, 419, canon 138; *Mansi* 4, 515; *Migne*, *P.L.* 50, 422—425). The same Council ruled that no bishop may call himself "Prince of bishops" or "Supreme Bishop" or any other title which suggests supremacy (*canon* 39), and it ruled that, if any of the African clergy dared to appeal to Rome, the same was *ipso facto* cast out of the clergy (*canon* 34; *Mansi* 4, 431). This council, which condemns any form of papacy or supremacy among bishops, is often quoted as having given to the world the first 'complete' Bible (including the Apocrypha).

Pope Leo the Great (d. 461) tried to interfere with the affairs of the Gallican Church over which St. Hilary presided as 'Supreme Pontiff'. Hilary had defrocked a French bishop who then appealed to Leo. When Leo tried to reinstate him St. Hilary told Leo in no uncertain terms to keep his Roman nose out of French affairs (*Migne*, *P.L.* 54, 630). Pope Leo, like Pope Stephen and Pope Zosimus, lost the case. Yet Roman theologians of today point out that these unsuccessful attempts by Pope Stephen, Pope Zosimus and Pope Leo prove that papal claims existed from the earliest centuries on. This is a totally false conclusion. It only proves the early corruption among Roman bishops and their ambition to extend their patriarchate over the Latin provinces of Africa and Gaul. No Roman bishop of the early church ever claimed jurisdiction over the Greek speaking patriarchates of the East. Pope Leo fully approved the canons of the Fourth Ecumenical Council (Chalcedon, 451; *Migne*, *P.L.* 54, 1038 & 1143) which ruled that the bishops of Constantinople and of Rome enjoy the "same" ecclesiastical honors (*canon* 28; *Mansi* 6, 1229). In the eyes of the Ecumenical Church Leo



was just one of the 'archbishops' (*Migne, P.L. 54, 951*).

The Ecumenical Church could no more have had a papacy than the United Nations could be ruled by one dictator. Anyone who has read the Fathers, the Councils and the theologians of the Middle Ages knows that the Ecumenical Church never held elections for a pope. The churches of Asia, Africa, Egypt and Eastern Europe little cared whom the Romans elected as bishop. The documents of the early church were never dated by the reign of an alleged Pope. The Fathers (Origen, St. John Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, etc.), who wrote commentaries on the Bible, never thought for one minute that they ought to submit their private interpretations to the Vatican (a "whorehouse") for approval and *imprimatur*.

Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604), as we have seen, was the first Roman bishop to gain some influence over the Latin churches of the West. His jurisdiction, however, was nothing in comparison with that of the Patriarch of Constantinople. When Cyriac of Constantinople began to sign the Synodical Acts with "Cyriac, Universal Bishop," Pope Gregory wrote immediately to Egypt to warn the other patriarchs that their jurisdiction was in danger: "for if ONE, as he (Cyriac) supposes, is Bishop Universal, it follows that you are not bishops" (*Migne, P.L. 77, 1004*). During the first 1000 years the East came much closer to establishing a papacy than the West. Pope Gregory warned the Emperor that any form of spiritual dictatorship is a sign that the end of the world is upon us (*Migne, P.L. 77, 891*).

Charlemagne (d. 814), in his desire to become a 'Roman' emperor, made the bishop of Rome the spiritual head of his empire. After the Germanic tribes had been forced by the sword to embrace christianity, Pope Leo III became the first 'international bishop' in the West, but had no power to appoint bishops or to convoke councils. From the 9th cen-

tury on (First Schism), the West began to resent domination by the East, though Constantinople was still the seat of theological learning while the Vatican was turning into a "whorehouse". As long as the Primates of Milan, Italy; Toledo, Spain; Rheims, France; London, England; etc. remained independent, one cannot speak of a Western 'papacy'.

Pope Leo IX (1054) effected the Final Schism between East and West. As neither half could claim to be the whole church, we may say that the Catholic or Ecumenical Church, founded by a Roman Emperor (325), lasted less than eight centuries. The Schism created two new names: The Greek Orthodox Church and the Roman Catholic Church.

Pope Gregory VII (Hildebrand, 1073) is the first real pope of the West. He wrote the "Dictatus Papae" (*Migne, P.L. 149, 485*); he claimed the sole title of Pope and Supreme Pontiff of the entire West; he subjected almost the entire West, country by country. Till May 11, 1073, the King and Primate of Spain had remained independent, but Hildebrand fabricated a new 'tradition' and wrote to Spain: "From the beginning the Kingdom of Spain has been under the proper jurisdiction of St. Peter" (*Migne, P.L. 148, 289*). He wrote to freshly converted Hungary that the Kingdom of Hungary is subject to the holy and universal mother church of Rome (*Migne, P.L. 148, 414*). Hildebrand wrote to England that since the days of Charlemagne the Western churches had paid taxes to Rome and the kings had taken an oath of subjection or fidelity to the pope (*Migne, P.L. 148, 344 & 674*). William the Conqueror (d. 1087), however, did not fall for the pope's lies and refused to recognize this Benedictine monk as his feudal lord. William wrote to Hildebrand: "I never have, nor will I now swear fealty; because neither have I promised such, nor do I find that my predecessors did it to

your predecessors" ("Fidelitatem facere nolui nec volo" *Migne, P.L.* 148, 748). Hildebrand wrote to King Philip of France (*Migne, P.L.* 148, 348) and to all leaders of the West, blackmailing them one by one into submission. Do not think that the West accepted the papacy without a fight. Because Rome was the only apostolic See of the West and the religious Capital of the empire, the Western bishops had no objection to recognizing the Bishop of Rome as their Archbishop, their Patriarch or Apostolic Priest (Apostolicus), and to granting him a primacy of honor, but they refused to surrender their independence. When Hildebrand's arrogance became unbearable, the bishops of the Holy Roman Empire convoked the Council of Worms (1076) and deposed him: "We renounce for future observance all obedience to you, which we never promised in the first place; and because, as you have publicly stated, none of us has ever been a bishop to you, you too shall no longer be an Apostolicus to any of us" (*Monumenta German. Hist., Leges, vol. 2, p. 46; see Mansi or Labbe, vol. 20, p. 466*).

Medieval historians, like Aventinus, describe Hildebrand thus: "He is a thief, a wolf, a gangster and a dictator" (*Annales Boiorum, bk. 5; 1554 ed., p. 571*). By setting one king against the other, one bishop against another bishop, and placing whole nations under interdict, i.e., depriving them of the sacraments of salvation until they had ousted or assassinated their rulers, Hildebrand gained control of the West. He excommunicated King Henry IV in these words: "O Blessed Peter... by your power and authority I depose King Henry... from the government of any and all kingdoms of Germany and Italy... and I loose all Christians from the bonds of their oaths which they have taken... and I forbid anyone to serve him as King" (*Migne, P.L.* 148, 74; *Liber Pont.* 2, 283).

St. Ives (d. 1114), Bishop of Chartres, was the first theo-

logian on earth to write a book "On the Primacy of the Roman Church" (*Migne, P.L. 161, 321*). This is just the beginning of Roman Catholicism, for St. Ives still taught that there were only two sacraments: Baptism and the Lord's Supper (*Migne, P.L. 161, 59–199*). By the 12th century we find the first Collections of canon laws in continental Europe which start out with: "Canon 1: On the primacy of Peter. Canon 2: On the primacy of the Roman Church (etc.)" (*Migne, P.L. 163, 753*). Ireland did not lose its independence and join the Roman Church till 1155 A.D. when Pope Adrian wrote to King Henry II: "Ireland and all islands... which have received the teachings of the Christian faith, belong by right to Blessed Peter and to the Holy Church" (*Thomas Rymer, "Foedera", 1745, vol. 1, part 1, p. 5; see Migne, P.L. 200, 883*).

Pope Innocent III in 1209 excommunicated King John of England, in 1212 he declared John deposed as king and asked King Philip of France to invade the British Isles unless England surrendered to Rome. On May 15, 1213 King John signed the British empire over to the Pope of Rome: "John, by the grace of God, King of England, Lord of Ireland... We offer and freely grant... to our lord Pope Innocent and to his Catholic successors the whole kingdom of England and the whole realm of Ireland... holding these lands as a feudal subject... and We swear fealty for them to our above-mentioned lord, Pope Innocent... Moreover, in proof of this our perpetual obligation and grant, We will establish... excluding in all respects the Peter's Pence, that the Roman Church shall receive annually one thousand marks sterling" (*Thomas Rymer, Foedera, 3rd ed., 1745, vol. 1, part 1, p. 57*). Pope Innocent III also forced King John to sign the oath of fealty: "I, John, by the grace of God, King of England and Lord of Ireland, from this hour forward, will be faithful (*fidelis ero*)... to the Roman Church and to

my lord, Pope Innocent and to his successors . . . So help me God and these holy Gospels . . . May 15, in the 14th year of our reign" (*Foedera, vol. 1, part 1, p. 58*).

Pope Innocent III (d. 1216) was the first pope who succeeded in subjecting the entire West. He is the first pope to write a book on "The Primacy of the Roman Pontiff" (*Migne, P.L. 217, 778*). The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) which he convoked may be called the first successfully held General Council of the West. This is the height of Roman Catholic power and of papal rule. "With the development of the primacy in the Middle Ages the papal letters grew enormously in number" (*C.E. 6, 202*). The Roman doctrines of Seven Sacraments, Purgatory, etc., are just about to be introduced.

## CHAPTER FIFTEEN

### PAPAL INFALLIBILITY

#### *WAS THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPE AN ACCEPTED DOCTRINE OF THE EARLY CHURCH?*

As we have already mentioned, St. Cyprian (d. 258), St. Basil (d. 379), St. John Chrysostom (d. 403), St. Augustine (d. 430), and all other Fathers had never heard of an alleged primacy and infallibility of the bishop of Rome, and Catholic scholars of today are forced to admit it (*C.E.* 7, 797; 8, 457). The bishops of Rome, lacking the knowledge of Greek, did not even attend the Greek Councils of the Ecumenical Church. If a Latin pope of the first thousand years would have dared to address an Ecumenical Council in 'broken' Greek and to inform the Greek bishops that he and he alone was "infallible", he would not only have been the laugh of the centuries, but he would have been excommunicated on the spot. The Roman Church Councils themselves refer to the Vatican as a "whorehouse" and to the popes as Antichrists, Monsters and "the Devil Incarnate". How could a boy of ten, like Pope Benedict IX, be infallible? He never attended a seminary, and was one of the greatest criminals to roam the earth at the time of the final schism (1054).

The Roman Catholic argument that there is a difference between *infallibility* and *impeccability* is not untrue, but totally beside the point. Both are divine attributes. A man is either of the Spirit or not. The Bible says: "by their fruits ye shall know them" (*Matth. 7:16*). Neither does the last verse of the Gospel of Matthew deal with papal infallibility. When Christ said: "I am with you always", He was not talking to a pope, but to baptizing preachers. God used this common expression a dozen times in the Old Testament, yet no Hebrew Highpriest ever claimed infallibility.

Roman theologians also like to speak of the infallibility of their church and of their pope, as if the pope is the church and vice versa. The permanence and divine guidance of the Church (the faithful) and the infallibility of one specific Italian bishop are two thoughts so far apart that no honest scholar could possibly confuse them. The faithful, the saints, both the laity and the clergy, are not infallible. Even if the church were infallible, it would not follow that one particular man in one city of one particular country possesses infallibility because of his geographical environment.

The early church believed that General Councils were guided by the Holy Spirit, and *therefore* they were more or less infallible. Yet, these 'infallible' councils decreed that one bishop may not interfere with the decision of other bishops, thus denying the modern doctrine that only one bishop is infallible and possesses sole jurisdiction. St. Augustine and the African Council of 419 not only found Pope Zosimus guilty of heresy and fraud, but warned him not to interfere with African affairs, because the Bishops of the First Ecumenical Council (325) "have decreed with great wisdom and justice that all matters should be settled in the places where they arise. And they did not think that the grace of the Holy Spirit would be wanting in any Province... unless you can imagine that God would inspire one individual [the bishop

of Rome] with justice, and would withhold the same from a multitude of bishops assembled in Council" (*Council of Carthage*, 419, canon 138; *Mansi* 4, 515; *Migne*, P.L. 50, 425).

The decisions of Ecumenical councils were binding on all bishops, the one of Rome included. During the reign of Pope Agatho (680) Emperor Augustus convoked the Sixth Ecumenical Council which condemned former Pope Honorius as a "heretic" (*Mansi* 11, 635). Yet Pope Agatho wrote to the Emperor: "Your Highness is incomparably more able to penetrate the meaning of the Sacred Scriptures than Our Lowliness" (*Migne*, P.L. 87, 1175). We see, then, that the early church did not know about papal infallibility because the popes never claimed it.

The illiterate Pope Zephyrinus (d. 221) had never heard of the Trinity and taught: "I know that there is only one God: Jesus Christ" (*Migne*, P.G. vol. 16, part III, p. 3380). Pope Callistus (d. 227) taught the same, erred in matters of penance, marriage and birth control, and introduced the practice of a Second Baptism for the lapsed (*Migne*, P.G. 16, III, 3369). Pope Liberius (352) denied the Trinity and "embraced the heretical perversity" (*Migne*, P.L. 27, 502). Pope Vigilius (d. 555) was forced by the Fifth Ecumenical Council to retract his heretical views (*Mansi* 9, 418; *Migne*, P.L. 69, 143). Thus is the official history of the 'papacy' until it finally deteriorated into a "whorehouse".

The Roman church admits that several popes were evil and obtained their office by bribery or murder. If the pope were infallible *ex officio*, it would follow that a divine attribute can be obtained by sin. It would also mean that one could bestow infallibility on oneself and that others can give it and take it away from their fellowmen.

The *Liber Pontificalis* says that Pope John XII (955-964) "occupied the throne nine years and three months... He spent his entire life in adultery" (*Liber Pont.* 2, 246). A local



Roman Synod of 963 dethroned its pope because of his sex orgies (*Mansi* 27, 662), and elected Benedict V. The clergy of Rome evidently believed that their council was above the pope. Why dethrone this immoral man in the 10th year of his pontificate, if he had been infallible all this time? If Pope John XII had been infallible, his local clergy must have confused his peccability with his fallibility, and they must have lacked the power to take his infallibility away. If they lacked the power, his dethronement was invalid and the legal line of papal successions was broken beyond repair. How can an infallible pope be wrong in claiming that he is still the true pope and legal representative of Christ, and how can his fallible and subordinate clergy be right in claiming that the pope has lost his supremacy?

The bishops of the Holy Roman Empire dethroned Pope Hildebrand (Worms, 1076) because his election had been illegal. Thanks to the armies of the 'prostitute', Mathilda, this pope was able to keep his throne, thus preserving his 'infallibility'.

Though Pope John XXIII legally convoked and presided over the Council of Constance (1414–1417); (*Mansi* 27, 537), the bishops of the 10th session (March 21, 1415) suspended and dethroned "Pope John" (*Mansi* 27, 652) and did not appoint a successor (Martin V) till Nov. 11, 1417. For two and a half years this Ecumenical Council, without the existence of any infallible pope, formulated infallible decrees, such as: the withholding of the cup from the laity, the condemnation of John Wycliff and John Hus, etc. As soon as Pope Martin V was elected by this council, he declared himself above the council and terminated its sessions. Either the Council or the new Pope was wrong. If Pope Martin was wrong, he was not infallible. If he was right, it follows that the Council had not the power to dethrone Pope John, and that the election of Pope Martin was invalid.

The Ecumenical Council of Basle (1431–1442) infallibly decreed “that a General Council is above the Pope” (*Session 2; 1432*). This Council, “being legitimately assembled with the Holy Ghost” (*Mansi 29, 21*) suspended and dethroned Pope Eugene in 1438 and 1439 (*Mansi 29, 165 & 179*). In absence of a pope this Council discussed the Immaculate Conception (*p. 182*) and condemned certain writings of the ex-pope (*Mansi, vol. 29, p. 205*).

Rome’s so-called “unbroken line of succession” is a myth. All churches continued to have bishops and the churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, etc. have kept lists of their bishops as well as Rome. Rome, however, was for years and years without a bishop because the local cardinal-presbyters voted for themselves. Pope Clement IV, for example, died on Nov. 29, 1268, and his successor, Pope Gregory X, was not ordained a priest and consecrated pope till March, 1272. The Western church, therefore, was without ‘infallible guidance’ for three years and four months at a time. From 1378 to 1409 Western Europe had two lines of popes, and from 1409 to 1415 it had three lines of popes. Pope Boniface VIII became pope by murdering Pope Celestine V. Pope Boniface VIII himself was dethroned and replaced by Pope Benedict XI, etc. etc. To hide the broken lines of succession our papal lists never give the date of a pope’s death, murder, flight or dethronement, but only the date of election. Throughout the centuries, including the 20th, the papal lists have been changed by removing popes and adding others and by constantly changing their dates of election.

Pope Boniface VIII was convicted and dethroned for being an atheist. Can an atheist be infallible? Pope John XXII denied the doctrine of immediate glory, was dethroned and burned in effigy as the Antichrist. Can an antichrist be infallible? Pope Alexander VI, a sex maniac, “bought” the papacy. Can infallibility be bought?

The mightiest of all popes, Innocent III (1215), denied the Immaculate Conception (*Migne, P.L.* 217, 581). The post-Reformation popes, Paul V and Urban VIII condemned Galileo for teaching that the earth moves. The entire history of the popes is one blunder after the other, one scandal after the other.

In 1870 the Vatican Council defined two dogmas, that of the primacy and of the infallibility of the pope of Rome. Hundreds of bishops protested, but the Jesuits had rigged the council. Archbishop Peter Kenrick of St. Louis, Mo., protested, explaining that the 'rock' is the faith confessed by Peter, not Peter confessing the faith (*Mansi* 51, 63). Bishop Joseph Strossmayer protested, but the council did not allow him to continue his speech (*Mansi* 51, 77). Bishop Joseph Hefele, the greatest Roman Catholic authority on the councils, explained that none of the Fathers and Bishops who attended the early Ecumenical Councils had heard of Papal Infallibility and that it had never been taught in the seminaries (*Mansi* 52, 80-84). John von Dollinger and hundreds of scholars protested, but the politicians won their objective. Before 1870 the Bishops of the West still could overrule the pope. After 1870 the pope became the sole dictator in matters of both faith and morals.

## CHAPTER SIXTEEN

# COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH

### *WHAT ARE THE COMMANDMENTS OF THE CHURCH?*

The pope, as Vicar of God, claims the power of making Commandments which are binding in conscience like the Commandments of God. American Catholics must keep sixteen Commandments, of which ten are by God and six by the Pope. The Papal Commandments for the U.S.A. are substantially as follows: (1) Thou shalt hear Mass every Sunday; (2) Thou shalt not eat meat on Fridays; (3) Thou shalt confess thy sins to a priest at least once a year; (4) Thou shalt receive Communion at Easter; (5) Thou shalt financially support thy priest; (6) Thou shalt not marry non-Catholics.

The Commandments of the Church are "Roman Catholic", i.e., they did not exist before the final Schism (1054). The third and fourth commandments were introduced by Pope Innocent III in 1215 (*Mansi 22, 1007*). The Ecumenical Council of 692 speaks of Sunday worship (canon 80), but excuses anyone who has to travel, to do business or who is prevented by other reasons (*Mansi 11, 978*). The customs of fasting, abstinence, Lent, Advent, Ember days, etc., differed everywhere in the early West. They are pagan in

origin. Each country, when converted, was told that it could keep its customs in this matter, because fasting was 'biblical'. When Emperor Constantine outlawed paganism and made Christianity the religion of the State, Rome and Spain christianized the Mithraistic fast on Saturdays (*Mansi* 2, 10; *Migne*, P.L. 20, 556). During the first schism between East and West (867) the Greeks condemned the West for fasting on Saturdays and for allowing milk and cheese on fast days. Rome adopted the Ember days from pagan England, but Spain refused to accept them till she lost her independence in the 11th century, while the Diocese of Milan, Italy, did not introduce them till the 13th century. All Irishmen ate meat during Lent till the 12th century when they lost their independence (*Migne*, P.L. 200, 883). When the Germans were forced to embrace Christianity in the 8th century, they observed a Lent of thirty-six days (*Migne*, P.L. 89, 865). The East observed Wednesdays and Fridays as fast days, lasting till 3:00 P.M. The West added the Saturday but abolished the Wednesday. The West allowed milk, cheese and dry meats during a fast, which custom eventually developed into a day of abstinence. In 13th-century France fasting was mostly voluntary for the laity. Even the Monastic Rule of St. Francis (1223) allowed brother-monks to decide for themselves whether they wished to fast (*Bullarium Rom., Tur. ed. vol. 3, p. 395*). The post-reformation Order of Jesuits ruled that their monks were too good to fast and to abstain from meat (*Pope Clement XIV, "Dominus ac Redemptor", July 21, 1773*). Post-reformation Spain did not have to abstain from meat. Early medieval France introduced Advent (40 days before Christmas) as a fast. Rome adopted it not as a fast, but as a fiesta. It was not till the 13th century that Rome attempted to bring some uniformity of customs and laws in the West; and it was not till the 15th century that Rome originated the "Commandments of the Church".

The fifth commandment of the Church is of very late origin and unknown to continental Europe. The post-Reformation Council of Trent (1563) still forced the laity to pay their "tithes" (10%) as a church tax which was collected under the same threat of punishment as State taxes (*Mansi* 33, 190). When church taxes were abolished, Europe got a financial break; but the United States, which already contributes to the Vatican more than all countries on earth combined, received a special Church Commandment (5th) which obligates the American Catholic under penalty of hell to support his church.

The sixth commandment used to stress the forbidden degrees of blood relationship in marriage, but since the Reformation it warns Catholics not to marry Protestants.

In the early Middle Ages, even after the final Schism (1054), the national churches refused to give up their national canon laws, their national rituals, their national customs, and their ancient rights of appointing bishops, canonization of national saints, etc. The Council of Florence (1439) and its host, St. Antoninus, are credited with having drawn up the first Roman Catholic Catechism and the first "Ten Commandments of the Church." According to some Roman theologians these Commandments were not binding on the entire West until ratified by the Council of Trent (1545). These ten commandments were eventually reduced to five for continental Europe and Latin America, while the English speaking church is bound by six commandments.

The first printed book of the Philippines is a Jesuit Catechism, entitled: "Doctrina Christiana" (Manila, 1593), which gives the Five Commandments of the Church as follows: (1) To hear Mass... (2) to confess sins... (3) to communicate at Easter... (4) to fast... (5) to pay tithes... This Spanish Catechism knows nothing about abstinence from meat on Fridays, nor about a prohibition of mixed marriages.

It is, of course, true that the "Six Commandments of the Church" are not the only laws of the Roman Catholic Church. Like the O.T. Scriptures, the Roman Church has hundreds of canon laws which are binding in conscience. However, there are six commandments which are especially promulgated for the laity. Every Roman Catholic knows these six laws by heart and believes that they are binding under penalty of hell.

## CHAPTER SEVENTEEN

### CANONIZATION OF SAINTS

#### *DID THE EARLY CHURCH CANONIZE SAINTS?*

The Ecumenical or Catholic Church of the first thousand years never canonized a saint. No local church of the West canonized a saint during the first seven centuries, i.e., before the rise of the Holy Roman Empire (Germany and Italy) and before the introduction of statue worship in Italy (8th cent.). The early Western Saints were martyrs or those who gained their prominence by public proclamation, as is still the case in the East. After the rise of saint-worship, the elevation to sainthood became a synodical or canonical procedure. As long as the churches of the West kept their national councils and national canon laws, the canonization remained in the hands of the national Primate and local Abbots of the West. By the end of the 12th century the Roman popes began to claim their sole rights of canonization. After five centuries of bitter struggle (17th cent.) Rome finally succeeded in making the pope the sole canonizer of Western Saints.

Of the alleged 10,000 saints of the church (the *Acta Sanctorum* gives the life stories of 7,000 of them) less than



3% have been canonized by a pope. None of the saints of the first seven centuries, like St. Patrick, St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose, St. Hilary, St. John Chrysostom, St. Athanasius, St. Cyril, St. Basil, etc. have ever been canonized by anyone, either during the first seven centuries or in later centuries.

Canonization is a canonical pronouncement by a local council, bishop or abbot that one of the members has entered into immediate glory and is *therefore* worthy of veneration. Such a judgment of one Christian by another is not only against the teachings of the Bible (*Rom. 2:2; I Cor. 4:5*), but it is based on an old 'heresy'. The East still believes, and the Church of Rome taught till the 14th century (*C.E. 8, 551*), that only a few bishops, martyrs, virgins, confessors (and "doctors") entered into immediate glory, while all others had to wait till the "Last" Judgment. It was up to the church to determine who these few privileged saints were. The few canonized saints were believed to become mediators and intercessors between God and men. "There is," says the Bible, "one mediator between God and men, the man Jesus Christ" (*I Tim. 2:5*).

One of the earliest of the canonized Saints is Emperor Charlemagne (742–814) who had ten wives: Hermingarda, Hildegarda, Liutgarda, Fastrada and six unnamed wives and concubines (*Einhard in Monumenta Germ. Hist. Script. 2, 453*). He converted the Germans by the sword, united Germany and Italy into a Holy Empire, and became the ecclesiastical legislator in the West with the right to convoke councils and to appoint bishops. He presided, for example, over the first General Council of the West (Frankfort, 794) and condemned statue worship. In the 15th century even the French ritual prescribed the Feast of St. Charlemagne (*Butler's Lives of the Saints 1, 189*), but the post-reformation Roman Catholic Ritual of 1570 (which is almost exclusively

Italian), omitted this German Saint. He is still venerated in Aachen, Germany and in two monasteries in Switzerland. If he is capable of interceding for German and Swiss Catholics, one wonders why he would not intercede for Italian Catholics as well. Historians, however, say that he loathed Italians.

On Jan. 31, 993 the German Emperor convoked a council at Rome and had the German bishop of Augsburg, St. Ulrich (d. 973), officially canonized. The Bull "Cum conventus" of Pope John XV (Feb. 3, 993) is now known as the 'First Bull of Canonization' (*Mansi* 19, 170). The Catholic Encyclopedia comments: "This was the first time that a solemn canonization had been made by a pope" (*C.E.* 8, 428). If this was not a canonization by an emperor, it was at least by a group of bishops assembled in council. There was no papacy. Even if granted that this man was canonized by the sole authority of a pope, why was it necessary after nearly one thousand years of christianity to introduce the novelty of papal canonizations? As the first 'papal' canonization was not the first canonization in the West, the pope did not follow the traditions of 'Peter', but merely began to copy customs of other Western churches. Neither the canonizer (Pope John) nor the canonized (Bishop Ulrich) was such as to warrant a change. The immoral Pope John is described by the great contemporary Saint, Abbo of Fleury (d. 1004), as a man "covetous of filthy lucre and corrupt in all his dealings" (*Muratori, Annali, A.D.* 996; *vol.* 5, *p.* 498). The *Liber Pontificalis* says that he distributed all church property among his relatives (*Liber Pont.* 2, 260). This pope was dethroned, driven out of Rome, and replaced by Pope Gregory V. Bishop Ulrich was the illegitimate son of a German Princess who was forced to leave her country and to enter a Swiss monastery. Through her influence and that of her royal family, Ulrich was made a bishop without the consent of the people,

which made his ordination invalid. Ulrich himself designated his nephew as his successor, thus keeping the bishopric in the royal family. The Council of Ingelheim once more declared the new appointment without election illegal and uncanonical. Besides being a convicted nepotist, Bishop Ulrich was also a 'heretic', because he believed, like the Menonites of today, that there were three sacraments: Baptism, Lord's Supper and Foot washing. He also ruled that Baptism could be administered only twice a year (Easter and Pentecost) and the Lord's Supper four times a year (*Migne, P.L. 135, 1071*). Ulrich was a staunch supporter of the German nobility and therefore had the admiration of the Emperor. The Roman Catholic Ritual of 1570 just ignored the existence of the first saint canonized by a pope.

St. Fulbert (d. 1028), the pupil of Pope Sylvester II, was canonized by the Gallican Church (*Acta Sanctorum, 10, 847*). The French ritual celebrated his feastday till 1633 when it was discovered that the Saint was a 'heretic'. Like Pope Sylvester, he denied the "real presence" (*Migne, P.L. 141, 334*). It was considered inconsistent to condemn his pupil, Berengarius, as a heretic, and to venerate his professor as a saint. All the altars of St. Fulbert were destroyed, and all those who had trusted their salvation in him evidently had prayed in vain.

By taking a quick look in the Catholic Encyclopedia and in the Lives of the Saints one finds that Emperor Constantine and Photius are Saints in the East, but heretics in the West. Joachim (d. 1202) was canonized by the Cistercian monks and is venerated till this day (feastday: May 29), though Pope Alexander IV condemned him as a heretic and Pope Innocent III burned all his books. St. John Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Hilary, St. Cyprian, etc., are still venerated as saints though they denied papal supremacy, infallibility, priestly power of forgiving sins, statue worship,

and nearly every other Roman doctrine of today. St. Bruno (d. 1101) was canonized by the Carthusian monks, but not by a pope. St. Anselm (d. 1109) was canonized by the Benedictine monks, but not by a pope. St. Malachy (d. 1148), Archbishop of Ireland, was canonized by St. Bernard, the head of the Cistercian monks. The Catholic Encyclopedia calls it a "canonization of a saint by a saint" (C.E. 4, 252). Because Pope Clement III in 1190 is said to have recognized this Irish saint, Rome now claims that this constitutes "the first papal canonization of an Irishman" (C.E. 4, 252). Oh poor St. Patrick (d. 461)! The confusion lies in the fact that Ireland lost its independence in 1155. Though the Irish St. Brigid ("Sanct Brigit", Sancta Brigida) has been a saint for 1500 years and was called the "pearl of Ireland" *Hiberniae margarita* (*Acta Sanct.* 8, 576), she has no place in the Roman Ritual.

Roman Catholics today may celebrate such Italian myths and feastdays as "St. Peter's Chains" (Aug. 1), the Stigmata of St. Francis (Sept. 17), the Miraculous Blood of St. January (Sept. 19), the "Chair of St. Peter" (Jan. 18), etc. They are asked to pray to purely legendary saints like St. Veronica (*vera icon*; true image, a fake relic which became mistaken for a person); St. Longinus ("the one with the spear"); St. Christopher ("Christ bearer"); St. Ann (Hannah: *I Sam.* 1:2); St. Agatha, St. Cecilia, St. Lucy, St. Agnes and St. Catherine (representing the virtues of goodness, purity, innocence and immaculateness); or such pagan-christian compositions as Santa Claus (Claes was the personification of the Germanic god, Thor; christianized by Northern Europe as a saint: Sinter Claes; mistaken by the Spanish for a female: Santa Claus; falsely identified with Nicolaus, a saint buried in Italy, a country which has never heard of a Santa Claus, but which believes in Bafana, a female who brings gifts on February 6th, which is the oldest date for Christmas).

Another famous 'mistaken' saint is St. Michael (Sept. 29), an angel. "Michaelmas" (Feast of Michael) used to be a feast of the dedication of a local church. Soon the name of this church was mistaken for a saint and people began to pray to him. The Bible says not to do so (*Col. 2:18*).

The "Litany of All Saints" lists the Western Fathers: St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and St. Jerome; but ignores the Eastern Fathers, such as St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril and St. Basil. It includes the founders of Western monasteries, like St. Benedict, St. Bernard, St. Dominic and St. Francis; but it ignores such famous founders of national churches as St. Patrick.

In our 20th century Rome removed the sainthood from six popes: St. Anacletus, 100–112; St. Liberius, 352–363; St. Felix II, 363–367; St. Anastasius II, 496–498; St. Stephen II, 752–757; and St. Stephen V, 816–817. Though the Roman Ritual and the Liber Pontificalis say that Cletus and Anacletus are two different popes, of different nationality, living in different centuries, having different feastdays and detailed biographies, Rome now teaches that Saint Anacletus never existed. Yet this legendary Saint and Pope "ordained 5 Elders, 3 Deacons and 6 Bishops" and "reigned 9 years, 3 months and 10 days" (*Roman Breviary, July 13*). Pope Felix II not only had his sainthood removed, but 1600 years after his death he was declared an anti-pope. Yet, anti-pope Hippolytus (d. 235) has kept his sainthood. All the statues, altars and liturgies of these de-sainted popes are now being removed, though for nearly 1,000 years millions of Italian peasants sought their intercession and trusted their salvation in the hands of canonized saints. It is, therefore, clear that canonizations are not *ex cathedra*, or infallible.

Up to 1960 there were less than 285 Roman Catholic Saints who have been canonized by a pope (*see UP., March 27, 1958*). These were canonized during the late Middle Ages

and in modern times. One-third of them are Italians (95); while France, Spain, Austria, Switzerland and Japan have 157 saints; thus leaving about 31 saints for the rest of the world. As the Roman Ritual has room for only 365 feastdays, and as several days must remain reserved for Christ, Mary, the Apostles and for the early non-canonized saints, Rome has little use for non-Italian Saints except a few for propaganda purposes.

Today, the cost of canonization runs as high as \$200,000 and only the rich monasteries can afford to have one of their monks canonized. The erection of national shrines, the organizing of pilgrimages, and the sale of new statues, medals, relics, booklets, etc., makes the original investment worth while. The process of canonization is in two stages: (1) beatification for local worship, (2) sainthood for universal veneration. This division is of late origin. The Middle Ages made no distinction between "Sanctus" (holy), "Beatus" (blessed) or "Venerabilis" (worthy of veneration). The Roman Ritual calls the "Venerable Bede" sometimes Blessed Bede, sometimes Saint Bede. So the Middle Ages call St. Peter more often "beatus" (blessed) than "sanctus" (saint). "Blessed" Virgin is more common than "Saint" Mary.

The recognition of an old non-Italian Saint by Rome takes, perhaps, more pressure and more funds than the canonization of a modern saint. In England, for example, St. Bede was canonized almost immediately by his own church (*Breviary*, May 27; *Butler's Lives of the Saints II*, 404). So were the British Primates, like St. Lanfranc (d. 1089), St. Anselm (d. 1101), etc. None of them were included in the new Roman Ritual of 1570. Only after much pressure were some of the British Saints recognized. "Saint Anselm was in 1720 declared a Doctor of the Church, though never formally canonized" (*Butler's Lives II*, 141). St. Bede was finally declared a Doctor of the Church in 1899 through the efforts

of Cardinal Wiseman (*Butler II*, 404). Lanfranc, who is still called "Blessed", never got his belated doctor's degree because he refused to relinquish his title of 'Supreme Pontiff' and refused to surrender Great Britain to Pope Hildebrand.

The Council of Trent (1545–1563) abolished the national canon laws and local disciplinary customs of the Western churches. Pope Pius V (1570) abolished all national rites, liturgies and hymns, and published the first "Roman Catholic" Ritual for the entire West. Pope Urban VII in 1634 finally succeeded in depriving the national churches and independent monasteries of their age-old rights of bestowing sainthood on their members. The whole struggle over canonization rights lasted from the 12th to the 17th century, beginning with Pope Alexander III (d. 1181) and ending with Pope Urban VII (1634). "Urban VII published in 1634 a Bull which put an end to all discussions by reserving to the Holy See exclusively not only its immemorial right of canonization, but also that of beatification" (*C.E.* 2, 366).

## CHAPTER EIGHTEEN

### CLERICAL CELIBACY

#### *WHEN WAS CLERICAL CELIBACY INTRODUCED AT ROME?*

In pre-Reformation days the average priest or bishop was not married, but raised his children openly. The oldest illegitimate son had the privilege of becoming assistant pastor of his father's church with the right to succeed him. Some popes had as many as seven children; some priests and bishops raised as many as seven children per year. Almost every priest and bishop was the illegitimate son of a priest or bishop.

It is, of course, ridiculous to define this condition as "clerical celibacy". Christ would call it "an evil and adulterous generation". If we were to define clerical celibacy as it is understood by the Catholic laity: 'the status of a priest or monk who abstains from all sexual relations', we would have nothing to write about. We are forced, therefore, to use the definition of the Catholic hierarchy: 'the single life of a priest or monastic, bound by law or vow not to marry'. According to hierarchical thinking such a "vow of chastity" cannot be broken by any amount of unlawful sex relations, nor by the unlawful fathering of any number of children,



but only by 'lawful' marriage. A Roman priest who breaks the Commandments of God by committing adultery can obtain forgiveness by simply confessing it to a fellow-priest. A Roman priest who breaks the Commandments of the Pope by 'attempting' marriage, becomes automatically an excommunicated renegade.

The Middle Ages had some ten 'shades' of celibacy, ranging from the status of monks who slept with young virgins 'as brother and sister' to the status of bishops who married before ordination, who continued to sleep with their wives after ordination, but refrained, as ordained ministers, from raising children. When we exclude the monks and nuns, and we use the word 'celibacy' as it is understood today by Roman theologians, we must say that priestly celibacy originated in Rome in the 11th century and was forced on the West during the 12th and 13th centuries.

The Roman Catholic Bible says: "It behoveth therefore a bishop to be... the husband of one wife" (*I Tim.* 3:2). The same goes for deacons (*I Tim.* 3:12). In the language of the early church the bishops (elders) and deacons constituted all the clergy. The Bible further regulates what sort of wives and children the clergy ought to have (*I Tim.* 3:4 & 11). "Forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats", explains the Bible, are pagan practices and therefore "doctrines of devils" (*I Tim.* 4:1-3). For a Bible Christian, here ends all controversy; but we are to establish the origin of celibacy and to give its history.

Peter was a married man. As an apostle he kept his home and had his mother-in-law staying with him (*Matt.* 8:14). His wife accompanied him on his journeys (*I Cor.* 9:5). The early church believed that the wedding of Cana was Peter's wedding (*John* 2:1). St. Clement informs us that "Peter... had children" (*Migne, P.G.* 20, 278). Bishop Eusebius (d. 340) informs us that Peter's wife was Perpetua (*Migne, P.G.* 20,

279). The fourth-century Church of Rome held that Petronilla was the real daughter of Peter and transferred her bones to her father's church in Rome. Up to the introduction of celibacy Petronilla's feastday (May 31) was a Holy Day (*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, A.D. 1076).

The evangelist, Philip, was married and had four daughters (*Acts* 21:8). Jude, the brother of the Lord, was married, and "the grand-children of Jude" were still living in the 2nd century (*Migne*, P.G. 20, 254). The entire third book of Eusebius deals with "The Apostles who lived in marriage" (*Migne*, P.G. 20, 278). Peter Abelard (d. 1142) in his famous "Yes and No" has a chapter on: "Whether all apostles had wives, except John?" (*Migne*, P.L. 178, 1492). Besides Eusebius, he quotes St. Ambrose of Italy: "All apostles had wives, except John and Paul". He also quotes St. Jerome of Rome: "James, the brother of the Lord, was of perpetual virginity". The early church held that the majority of the apostles were married. The question is not so much as to whether this is true or false, but how these views were even possible if celibacy had been of apostolic origin.

St. Clement, the first known Presbyter of Rome (the alleged 4th pope), is the first one to interpret the biblical text on the family of the clergy (*I Tim.* 3) and speaks of "our wives" (*uxores nostras*; *Mansi* 1, 189). St. Clement of Alexandria (d. 220) explains that celibacy is pagan and approves the marriages of all the clergy and all the laity: "The Church fully receives the husband of one wife, whether he be an Elder, Deacon or layman" (*Migne*, P.G. 8, 1192). St. Cyprian (d. 258), Bishop of Africa, was a married man (*Migne*, P.L. 3, 1544); and after the death of Presbyter Caecilius, he provided also for the latter's wife and children (*Migne*, P.L. 3, 1545).

Roman theologians maintain that clerical celibacy was established by law in the 4th century: "the first enactment on the subject is that of the Spanish Council of Elvira"

(*C.E.* 3, 484). The Council of Elvira was held after the Empire had outlawed Mithraism. According to the present text it was held in 324 A.D., and attended by nineteen Spanish bishops, including Bishop Hosius. There are so many contradictions and blunders in the text that many are of the opinion that the canons have been drawn up by illiterates, or have been altered in a later century. Some of these Spanish pastors who attended this local conference might have been non-Catholic (Arian) or freshly converted from the Mithraistic priesthood. This council was certainly not "Roman", least of all "Ecumenical". Canon 33, employing a double negative, actually forbids all forms of celibacy: "Placuit in totum prohibere Episcopis, Presbyteris et Diaconibus, vel omnibus clericis positis in ministerio, abstinere se a conjugibus suis et non generare filios. It is enacted that Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, and all the clergy engaged in the ministry, are totally forbidden to abstain from their wives and not to raise children" (*Mansi* 2, 11; *Migne, P.L.* 84, 305). Even if agreed that canon 33 was intended to read: "It is enacted that bishops... must entirely abstain from their wives", the text still does not refer to celibacy, because it implies that the clergy were married and had "wives". In this case the council merely introduced or approved the platonic marriages of the old pagan religion.

The First Ecumenical Council (Nice, 325) had nothing to say about celibacy. It was proposed in this council to forbid the Bishops and Deacons to live with their wives after ordination, but it was rejected (*Migne, P.G.* 67, 926 & 102; *Mansi* 2, 906). The council, however, forbade unmarried presbyters to have "subintroduced women" in their parsonages (*Mansi* 4, 410). In other words, the very first Catholic Council condemned the modern Roman practice of priests living with unmarried housekeepers, "for the Devil... incites them to the fires of desire."

The Apostolic Constitutions and Apostolic Canons (*Migne, P.G. 1; P.G. 137; P.L. 67*), fourth-century forgeries allegedly "set forth by Clement, Pontiff of the Roman Church", and up to the Reformation believed to have been the genuine writings of the Apostles, condemned celibacy: "Let not a Bishop, a Presbyter or Deacon put away his wife under pretense of piety." These forgeries make Peter explain the biblical phrase of "one wife" as follows: "I, Peter, decree that a bishop . . . must be the husband of one wife who herself is of one man" (*unius uxoris univirae virum; Migne, P.G. 1, 598*). "He who has been twice married after Baptism, or he who has a concubine, cannot become a bishop" (*Mansi 1, 52; Migne, P.G. 137, 70*).

The pre-Nicene Council of Neo-Caesarea (c. 315) allowed the marital status of the clergy, but, following the strict interpretation of "one wife", ruled that if the wife of a Presbyter "commits adultery after his ordination, he must put her away" (*Mansi 2, 541*). The post-Nicene Council of Gangra (c. 350) decreed: "If anyone shall maintain that it is not lawful to partake of the oblation when it is offered by a presbyter who has a wife, let him be anathema" (*Mansi 2, 1102*). Catholic Bishop Hefele explains this 4th canon: "As is well known, the Ancient Church, as still the Greek Church, allowed those clergy who were married before their ordination to continue in matrimony."

When the fourth century forced the pagan monks and nuns to embrace Christianity, the church was plagued with thousands of "Virgins" and "Beloved ones" (*agapetae*) who lived with the clergy without being married to them. The Fathers did not protest against the marital status of the clergy, but against the unmarried status of virgins who lived in platonic union with the clergy. Nearly all Fathers condemn these nuns who lived with presbyters and monks. St. John Chrysostom (d. 407) wrote a whole book "Against those

who live with unwedded virgins (*virgines subintroductas*)" (*Migne, P.G. 47, 495*). While in Rome, St. Jerome wrote in 384: "Whence come these unwedded wives, these new kind of concubines, these whores? . . . One house holds them and one chamber. They often occupy the same bed, and yet they call us suspicious if we suspect anything wrong. . . Their real aim is to indulge in sexual intercourse" (*Migne, P.L. 22, 402*).

Those who were ordained for the ministry married, the unordained monks remained single; or, as St. Athanasius (d. 373) puts it: "We see Bishops who have children and monks who take no thought of having posterity" (*Migne, P.L. 25, 534*). St. Gregory Nazianzen (d. 389), who presided over the Second Ecumenical Council (381) was born in a parsonage, the son of a bishop; his sister, Theosebeia, was married to St. Gregory (d. 386), Bishop of Nyssa (*Migne, P.G. 37, 323*).

The African Council of 419, attended by St. Augustine, constantly but respectfully speaks of the "sons of bishops" (*Mansi 4, 427*). The Fourth Ecumenical Council (Chalcedon, 451), which had the full approval of Pope Leo, allowed the presbyters to have wives, and only decreed that "Monks and Nuns shall not contract marriages" (*Mansi 6, 1228*). Catholic Bishop Hefele comments here: "The marriages contracted by priests until the beginning of the twelfth century were regarded as valid."

Some Roman scholars maintain that Pope Siricius (d. 399) and Pope Leo (d. 461) introduced celibacy by quoting seventh-century canons falsely attributed to them: "Even subdeacons are not allowed carnal marriages" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 673*). These spurious canons do not forbid marriage, but sexual intercourse. This is especially clear from other canons, for example: "A clergyman who marries a second wife shall be deposed" (*Migne, P.L. 13, 1145*). Pope Leo interpreted the biblical "one wife" as follows: "Those who have either

entered into second marriages or joined themselves in wedlock with Widows are not allowed to hold the episcopate" (*Migne, P.L. 54, 652*). When the Gallican Church under St. Hilary deposed a bishop, because "as the husband of a widow he could not hold the bishopric", Pope Leo thought that the bishop ought to be reinstated because there was not enough evidence that the bishop's wife had been married before (*Migne, P.L. 54, 631*). Hence Pope Leo did not believe in celibacy, not even for bishops.

St. Patrick (d. 461), a contemporary of Pope Leo, came from a long line of priests. In his "Confession" he writes: "I, Patrick, . . . have as father Calpornicus, a Deacon (diaconum), the son of Potitus, a Presbyter (Presbyteri)" (*Migne, P.L. 53, 801; Acta Sanctorum 8, 550*).

The early bishops of Rome were married, unless they were monks. According to the present text of the *Liber Pontificalis*, Pope Silverius (d. 538) was the son of Pope Hormisdas (d. 523), and Pope John XI (d. 935) was the son of Pope Sergius (ex patre Sergio, Papa; *Liber Pont. 2, 243*). The inventor of the *Liber Pontificalis*, Pope Felix IV (d. 530), was himself married, had many sons and grandsons who became priests, and his "great-grandson" became Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604), according to an 8th-century text of the *Liber Pontificalis*, used by St. Bede (*Migne, P.L. 95, 75*). Pope John XIII (d. 972) was "the son of Bishop John" (*Liber Pont. 2, 252*). Pope John XV (d. 996) was "the son of Presbyter Leo" (*Lib. Pont. 2, 260*).

Besides the ones already mentioned, the *Liber Pontificalis* lists the following popes as sons of priests: Pope Anastasius (401), Boniface (422), Felix (492), Anastasius II (498), Agapitus (536), Vigilius (555), Deusdedit (618), Marinus (884). During the first 1000 years of Christianity the sons of Roman priests were so legitimate that they qualified for the bishopric of Rome.

By the middle of the 6th century, when the monks and nuns had been taken from the streets, had been placed in monasteries and had been admitted to holy orders; when hierarchies had been established and bishops were no longer the biblical overseers of their flock (pastor), but had become overseers of other pastors, Emperor Justinian the Great (527–565) introduced by law the celibacy not only of monks but also of bishops. The Ecumenical Council of 692 made the celibate episcopate a law for the entire church. Presbyters and Deacons were allowed carnal marriage. Most likely the monks supported this new legislation in order to get control of the hierarchies. Whatever the reason, the Greek Orthodox Bible still reads: “*Dei oun ton Episkopon . . . einai mias gunaikos andra*” (*I Tim. 3:2*).

The French Council of Tours in 567 decreed that “A bishop should live with his wife as a sister” and “a bishop who has no wife may not keep strange women in his house” (*Mansi 9, 795*). The same council speaks of archpresbyters, deacons and subdeacons as being married as a matter of course (*p. 797*). Thus, after Emperor Justinian, the West still permitted platonic marriage for bishops and carnal marriage for priests.

Pope Gregory the Great (d. 604), to whom textbooks often ascribe the introduction of celibacy, decreed: “Those who are constituted in Sacred Orders . . . are not to leave their wives, whom they ought to govern with chastity” (*Migne, P.L. 77, 996*). Gregory did not forbid bishops and priests to have wives, but he forbade the modern Roman practice of unmarried clergy living with unmarried housekeepers: “Certain bishops, under pretext, as it were, of hired help, associate themselves in one house with women . . . put a stop to this” (*Migne, P.L. 77, 996*). Gregory also allowed Abbots to live in platonic union with nuns, as long as they did not know them carnally (*Migne, P.L. 77, 229 & 641*).

Gregory, a monk himself, might have been the first Roman bishop to impose platonic marriages on all the clergy, from bishops to subdeacons (*Migne, P.L. 77, 505*). As long as he allowed his clergy to live with their wives and allowed the monks of Monte Cassino to live platonically with nuns, we may not call this condition 'clerical celibacy'.

From the canons of the famous Ecumenical Quinisext Council (in Trullo, 692), we know exactly the clerical status at the end of the 7th century. The African bishops remarried when their first wife died (canon 12; *Mansi 11, 946*). The Armenian bishops belonged to a priestly caste and dynasty, allowing only the sons of priests to ordination (canon 33; *Mansi 11, 958*). The Roman clergy were allowed to have wives, but had to promise at the time of ordination to abstain from sexual intercourse (canon 13; *Mansi 11, 947*). The Eastern Emperor sought uniformity for the Ecumenical Church and asked the Council to pass a general law "for the whole church", which would include the "Roman Church" (*C.E. 4, 312*). The Council decreed that Bishops were not allowed to marry or to live with their former wife in the same house (canons 6 & 48), but the presbyters and lower clergy were allowed to continue their carnal marriage after ordination. The Council particularly warned Rome: "If, therefore, anyone shall dare...to deprive any of those who are in sacred orders: Presbyters, Deacons or Subdeacons, of cohabitation and intercourse with his lawful wife, let him be deposed. In like manner also, if any Presbyter or Deacon, under pretense of piety, shall divorce his wife, let him be excluded from communion" (*Mansi 11, 947*). Emperor Justinian II (702) mailed the text of the council to Rome, and Pope John VI and John VII (who were Greeks themselves and appointees of the emperor) fully approved their contents by official signature (*C.E. 8, 423*). Therefore, the pope of Rome, one hundred years after the death of Gregory, fully



agreed with the Catholic Councils that priests are allowed to raise children after ordination.

The Seventh Ecumenical Council (II Nice, 787) reconfirmed the same legislation as is observed today by the clergy of both the Greek Orthodox Church and the Uniat churches (Eastern rites of the Roman Church). The same council sought to abolish the platonic unions of the Western monks and nuns: "That henceforth no Double Monastery (Duplex Monasterium) shall be erected. . . Monks and Nuns shall not dwell together in the same monastery, for in thus living together adultery finds its occasion" (*Mansi* 13, 755). In spite of this warning by "the Holy Spirit", the Western monks continued their double lives in double monasteries till the Reformation.

Entering the period of the Holy Roman Empire (800) the status of the Roman clergy is as follows: The candidate for the priesthood marries the girl he loves before his ordination. According to the Gregorian or local Roman law he may live and sleep with the woman he loves after his ordination, but is forbidden to raise children. According to the general law of the Catholic Church this local law of Rome is 'unconstitutional', and Roman bishops are forbidden to impose any form of celibacy on their priests, while the Roman priests are forbidden under pain of excommunication to leave their wives. Emperor Charlemagne, as ecclesiastical legislator of the Holy Roman Empire, abided by the canons of the Ecumenical Church, and once more forbade unmarried priests to live with unmarried housekeepers (*Mansi* 13, 1082). However, many of the popes and priests preferred platonic unions with virgins to ordinary family life, because it gave them more liberty and less responsibility.

With the beginning of the temporal power of the bishops of Rome (8th cent.) the alleged chair of Peter fell into the hands of illiterate soldiers, political bandits, pope-kings and

prostitutes. In 853 a Benedictine Nun, the illegitimate daughter of a monk, was elected as pope (Popissa Johanna). The platonic marriages of monks and priests, sometimes called 'celibacy', created such immorality in the West that it became one of the main reasons for the First Schism (867) between East and West. Monsignor Duchesne admits that "The Lateran became a resort of persons of ill fame, and no virtuous woman could remain in safety at Rome" (*Duchesne, "Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes, A.D. 754-1073," London, 1908 ed. p. 224*). The life stories of Pope Sergius (904-911), John XI (931-936), John XII (955-964), John XIII (965-972), John XV (985-996) assure us that they did not practice celibacy (*Lib. Pont. 2, 240-260*). The Apostolic Palace in Rome had become a "whorehouse" (*Mansi 17A, 466; Baronius 15, 501; Liber Pontif. 2, 246; Migne 136, 908; Monumenta Germ. Hist., Script. 3, 346; Muratori, R.I.S. vol. 3, part 1, p. 327*).

The Council of Rheims (991) refers to the Italian popes as "monsters" (*Mansi 19, 132*), and Archbishop Gerbert (later Pope Sylvester II, d. 1003) in his confession of faith assured the French clergy that "I do not prohibit marriage", but he did oppose clerical concubinage (*Migne, P.L. 139, 169*). Entering the 11th century we find great immorality among the clergy of the West, because of the scandalous example of the Roman popes. We do not find celibacy in the West, because (1) the Bible does not support it; (2) the Ecumenical Church did not support it; (3) Rome taught it, but did not practice it; (4) the West was not yet under papal jurisdiction; (5) marriage was not yet a sacrament.

Pope Benedict IX (1032) was consecrated pope when he was a boy of ten (*Migne, P.L. 142, 679*) and was, of course, too young to marry before his ordination. He was driven out of Rome by Pope Sylvester III (1033) but restored by the Emperor in 1037. Pope Benedict IX then sold the papacy

to his uncle, Pope Victor II, in order to become free to enter matrimony. When the girl turned him down he demanded that the papacy be returned to him. When his uncle refused he fought his way into Rome and took the Lateran Palace (St. John's), while Pope Sylvester III occupied the Vatican Palace (St. Peter's) and Pope Victor II occupied St. Mary's. The Emperor dethroned all three popes and replaced them with the German Pope Clement II (1046). The World Almanac of 1959 printed an approved list of popes which records the name of Pope Benedict IX three times: under 1032, 1045 and 1047. They might as well have listed him a fourth time, because he still claimed to be the real pope during the Schism of 1054. We have the testimony of Pope Victor III himself that the three-time 'elected' pope "led a life, after he had obtained the bishopric, which was so evil, so horrible and so execrable, that I shudder to describe it" (*Migne, P.L. 150, 817*). Bishop Bonizo has described Benedict's "adulteries and murders" (*Migne, P.L. 150, 817*) and the Council of Sutri (Dec. 20, 1046), which dethroned the three popes, admitted "that in the whole church scarcely one can be found who is not an illiterate, a simoniac or one living in concubinage" (*Migne, P.L. 150, 819*.)

Pope Leo IX in 1051 imposed absolute celibacy on the clergy of the diocese of Rome, which caused such a protest that it became one of the main causes for the Final Schism between East and West (1054). The 12th-century bishop, St. Bruno, tries to justify Pope Leo by saying: "Bishops and Priests were given to sensual pleasures and fornication. The Priests were not ashamed to take wives, they held their weddings openly, they contracted unlawful matrimony, and gave legal dowries to those with whom, according to the laws, they were not permitted to live in one and the same house. . . . But, what is worse than all these things, scarcely anyone could be found who was not either a simoniac, or who had not

been ordained by simoniacs . . . Such was the Church, such were the Bishops and the Priests, and such were the Roman Pontiffs themselves who were supposed to set examples for all others" (*Migne, P.L.* 165, 1110; *Muratori, R.I.S.*, 3, 2, 347).

Leo's decree caused the Schism, but did not effect celibacy. The Roman clergy refused to leave their wives, while the clergy of the independent churches of Ravenna, Italy; Rheims, France; Compostella, Spain; Canterbury, England, etc., were not influenced by it. St. Heribert (d. 1045), Archbishop of Milan, was a married man and like his predecessors had never imposed celibacy on his clergy. It was his successor, Archbishop Guido (1059), who embraced "Roman Catholicism" and who told his bishops to impose celibacy on their clergy. The Milanese prelates, however, refused to publish the decree, fearing for their lives.

Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII, 1074) was the first to successfully establish celibacy in Rome by using physical force. He ordered St. Peter Damian to write his 'filthy' book against the clergy, the "Book of Gomorrha" (*Migne, P.L.* 145, 159—190), which was to excite the mob. He then armed the mob with clubs and pitchforks and together with Mathilda's soldiers they drove the wives and children of the clergy from their homes and locked them up in Monte Cassino. This was the greatest mass-divorce and vow-breaking of all history. Contemporary historians, like Marion Scott (d. 1086), report this event under A.D. 1074: "The Pope . . . forbids the Presbyters, Deacons and all clerics to have wives and to live in any manner with women" (*Migne, P.L.* 143, 623). "He removed the married priests from divine office" (*Migne, P.L.* 160, 217).

Actually, celibacy was introduced in the 11th century by a woman, Countess Mathilda, who had given asylum in her castle to Anselm, Damian and Hildebrand, and who with the aid of this triumvirate plotted to overthrow the power of the German Emperor and to establish a Western European

Church. Clerical celibacy was to destroy the existing episcopal dynasties and to break the power of the independent national churches. Hildebrand was made pope in 1073 without the canonical election by cardinals, as prescribed by the Roman Council of 1059. This ambitious monk ordered Archbishop Siegfried of Mainz to impose celibacy on the clergy of Germany. The primate first tried to cooperate with Hildebrand, but was nearly murdered by his own priests at the Council of Erfurt (1074). When Hildebrand continued to brand the bishops of the Holy Roman Empire as "ye sons of whores", they finally convoked the General Council of Worms (1076) and dethroned Hildebrand, or at least informed him that he was no longer considered their patriarch: "You have, as it were, filled the whole church with the stench of a very grave scandal by living and cohabiting more intimately than is necessary with a strange woman (*alienae mulieris*, i.e. Mathilda of Tuscany). . . This general complaint is everywhere heard, that at the Apostolic See all judgments and all decrees are made by women (Mathilda, Beatrix and Agnes) and that the whole church is governed by this new Senate of Women. And no protest is strong enough against the insults and defamation of bishops whom you call in a most undignified manner the 'sons of whores' (*filios meretricum*), and similar names. Wherefore. . . we renounce for future observance all obedience to you, which we never promised in the first place; and because, as you have publicly stated, none of us has ever been to you a bishop, you too shall no longer be an Apostolicus to any of us" (*Monumenta Germ. Hist., Leges, folio vol. 2, p. 44; see also: Mansi or Labbe 20, 466; Hefele, Conciliengesch. 5, 67*).

The Italian Council of Piacenza ratified the decisions of Worms. Thus the bishops of Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Holland, etc., renounced Hildebrand. One cannot escape the conclusion that either Hildebrand was an evil intruder, or

the bishops of the entire empire were irresponsible liars and heretics.

The West might have had another reason for introducing celibacy. Prior to the Schism (1054) only Bishops presided over the Lord's Supper (Mass), only Bishops were called 'Sacerdos' (priest or sacrificer), and they alone were forbidden to marry by the ecumenical canons. Presbyters (presbyterus, elder) were allowed to baptize for the bishop, but were not allowed to celebrate Mass, to confirm, or to pronounce benediction. After the Schism the Roman "Elder" became a "Priest" (sacerdos), or at least a "Mass-priest" with the delegated power to concelebrate Mass when assisted by a deacon, subdeacon and the lower clergy. It is for this reason that Britain, which did not belong to the Holy Roman Empire, continued to allow its clergy to enjoy marriage, but forbade its presbyters to say Mass (*Council of Winchester, 1079; Mansi 20, 460*).

The papacy was not fully established till the 13th century. For that reason the first three Lateran Councils (1123, 1139, 1179) were very vague in matters of celibacy and merely forbade the priests to live with concubines and housekeepers (*Mansi 21, 282; 21, 527; 22, 224*). Only the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) emphasized that married clerics are to be punished (*Mansi 22, 1003*), but it did not enforce the law. The Council of Clermont (1095) decreed: "That the sons of canonical presbyters, deacons and subdeacons should not be promoted to holy orders or ecclesiastical honors, unless they become monks or canons" (*Mansi 20, 818*). The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) passed similar legislation without teeth, while partially approving the scandalous lives of the Canonical Priests: "We firmly forbid that the sons of Canons, especially the illegitimate ones (maxime spurii), be made Canons in secular churches which their fathers occupy" (*Mansi 22, 1018*).

By reading the lives of 12th-century Saints we still run across married priests. The Catholic Encyclopedia, for example, says that St. Aelred "was the son of one of those married priests of whom many were found in England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries" (*C.E.* 1, 172). Archbishop Eskil (d. 1181), Primate of Sweden, had a wife and daughter. Bohemia did not accept celibacy till 1195, and the Scandinavian countries were not subjected to Roman celibacy till 1222, i.e. seven years after the Fourth Lateran Council.

Peter Abelard (1142), a very learned and strict Abbot, relates that the wives and children of the monks lived right on the property of the monastery. Abelard himself, as a matter of course, lived in platonic union with Abbess Heloise, and both are buried together in the Paraclete. All theologians and Saints of the 12th century expose the immorality of the clergy.

Some believe that the era of St. Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274) and St. Bonaventure (d. 1274) was the height of Roman piety. A letter of Pope Gregory X (d. 1274), for example, reveals that Bishop Henry of Louvain, Belgium, bragged of having fathered fourteen children in less than two years; yet the pope did not suspend him. St. Hildegarde, St. Catherine of Sienna, St. Bridget of Sweden, St. Vincent Ferrer, etc., testify to the gross immorality of the clergy of the 13th and 14th centuries.

Pope John XXIII (1410—1415) raped two hundred women. The famous council which he convoked in 1414 drew one thousand prostitutes to the city of Constance. The text of the council reveals that this pope committed every sex crime that is humanly possible (*Mansi* 27, 663). Celibacy was the law, but from the pope to the lowest cleric nobody even thought of observing it. The Diet of Frankfort (1457) reveals that Pope Calistus III was as great a sex maniac as any before him.

The 15th century was more immoral than the 14th. Pope Sixtus IV (1471–1484), though he was a Franciscan monk, lived with his mistress, Theresia, had two illegitimate children, and created them cardinals (*Alzog* 2, 905). Pope Innocent VIII (1484–1492) “had a number of natural children” (*Alzog* 2, 905), and performed the marriage of his illegitimate granddaughter, Perretta, right in the Vatican. Pope Alexander VI (1492–1503) had six known illegitimate children; lived with the whore Vanozza de Catanei, a twice divorced woman who bore to him Juan, Caesar, Joffre and Lucretia; he had one child, “John Borgia”, by a teenager, named Julia Farnese, who remained his mistress till his death. By glancing over his biography (*Diary*), written by Bishop Burchard, papal immorality hits one in the face. On Wednesday, May 7, 1494, for example, the *Diary* says that marriage was contracted between Joffre Borgia, the son of Pope Alexander VI, and Sancia of Aragon, the illegitimate daughter of King Alphonso of Sicily. On Feb. 16, 1499, Lucretia, the daughter of Pope Alexander, had a miscarriage. . . etc. Every detail of the pope’s sex life has been immortalized. Even the indulgences from sin which the Pope granted during the Jubilee Year of 1500 are enumerated in detail: A Benedictine monk married a woman and slept with her; a priest slept with his niece who became pregnant; a Franciscan monk married a woman and left her, etc.

Pope Julius II (1503–1513) had three known illegitimate children (*Pastor* 5, 369). He married his daughter, Felicia, publicly in Rome. Pope Leo X (1513–1522), Martin Luther’s pope, was ordained at the age of seven, created a cardinal at the age of thirteen, and as pope he continued the sex orgies of his predecessors. Pope Paul III (1534–1549), under whom the Council of Trent convened (1545–1563), was the brother of the papal concubine, Julia Farnese. He had four illegitimate children and did not want any reform. In 1535



he excommunicated King Henry VIII of England. American text books and movies deal at length with the immorality of this British layman, but refuse to mention the sex activities of a Roman Pope who was infinitely more immoral than the British king.

Thus we see that up till the Reformation the papacy had remained the proverbial "whorehouse". "The episcopal sees," explains the Catholic Encyclopedia, "were treated as property which descended by hereditary right from father to son... not only priests but bishops openly took wives and begot children to whom they transmitted their benefices" (*C.E.* 3, 485). This "generated a public opinion in which it was not accounted a reproach to be known as the SON OF A PRIEST. Undoubtedly the SONS OF THE PRIESTS formed a LARGE CLASS. There was a natural tendency to bring them up as CLERICS, and there was no doubt an immense amount of scheming... to secure their promotion to benefices held by their FATHERS" (*C.E.* 3, 487).

Martin Luther (d. 1546) did not abolish priestly celibacy because it did not exist. He abolished clerical adultery, and taught that no cleric was allowed to raise a family unless he was married.

The pre-reformation monks were bound by vow, and the secular priests were bound by law not to marry. Once the Reformers separated from Rome they were no longer bound by papal laws nor by vows which they had taken in days of ignorance and superstition. Catholic theologians are quick to teach that converts to Roman Catholicism have no obligation to keep the oaths of their Protestant faith — such as the marriage vow to an unbaptized spouse, or the oath of a sponsor to raise the baptized child in the Protestant faith, etc. (*Conway, Question Box*, p. 87)—but the same theologians seem slow to understand that non-biblical oaths taken in ignorance or under duress are not binding to con-

verts from Roman Catholicism.

Under Pope Pius IV (1563) the Council of Trent finally admitted that there was some immorality going on among the clergy and it dedicated one chapter to the "Illegitimate Sons of Clergymen" (*Filii clericorum illegitimi*; *Session 25, chapt. 15, Dec. 3, 1563*). From the very beginning of Roman celibacy (11th cent.) the councils had passed similar legislation (*Migne, P.L. 155, 1643*), but never meant a word of it. Again Rome was insincere and refused to put teeth in the Tridentine legislation: "The illegitimate sons of clergymen are excluded from certain benefices and pensions. . . It shall not be lawful for the sons of clergymen, not born in lawful wedlock, to hold an ecclesiastical benefice in those churches wherein their FATHERS have or had a benefice; nor to minister in any way in said churches; nor to have pensions . . . And if a FATHER and a SON shall be found at this present time to hold benefices in the same church, the SON shall be compelled to resign his benefice, or to exchange it for another benefice away from that church, within the space of three months" (*Mansi 33, 190*).

Still weaker legislation was passed in regard to the illegitimate sons of bishops. Neither the adulterous father nor the illegitimate son was deposed from the priesthood, but the two were merely asked to separate. Naturally the Roman priests continued their cohabitations without wedlock, while the Council of Trent allowed the lower clergy of the four minor orders to marry and to raise families (*Mansi 33, 132*). However, the late invention of Low Masses has made the orders of Porters, Lectors, Exorcists and Acolytes obsolete professions or benefices. Therefore, when a modern priest-candidate receives the ordinations of the lower orders he may not apply the Tridentine privilege, because "in our day such observance is practically impossible" (*C.E. 3, 487*).

During the 17th and 18th centuries the priests continued

their adulterous cohabitations and the popes their illicit amours. The Catholic Encyclopedia, which spreads the life stories of the popes over sixteen volumes and always pretends that this particular pope happens to be an exceptionally bad one, says, for example, of Benedict XIII (d. 1730): "The pope was ignorant of the peculations and venality of his favourite, whose greed did much to diminish the prestige of the Holy See" (C.E. 2, 432).

Influenced by Protestantism, many priests of the 18th century began to raise their children in wedlock. The Vatican Concordat with Napoleon (Pope Pius VII, 1801; *Mirbt*, No. 130) ratified the marriages of all French priests who had taken the oath to the Constitution after the French Revolution of 1787. French bishops, like Talleyrand, were legally married, while other French Prelates, like Cardinal Richelieu, lived in open adultery and preferred to follow the letter of the Roman law of celibacy.

The same conditions exist today. The Roman Catholic priests of the Eastern Rites are allowed to be married (like the Greek Orthodox), even in the United States. Numerous American priests of Western European extraction are secretly married, while hundreds of priests of the Latin dioceses of Bolivia, Mexico, Panama, Peru and Ecuador raise families in their rectories without wedlock. At one time Rome tried to solve the Latin American problem by granting the Spanish the marital privileges of the East. Today Rome looks the other way and pretends not to know how the Latin priests behave. In the United States many housekeepers resent being called a "maid", and insist on being legally married to the priest. For a secret wedding the priest removes his collar, obtains a license out of State, and tips the county clerk for putting the legal papers at the bottom of the stack, safe from newspapermen. Thus he avoids scandal, is free from adultery, and has made inheritance legal.

The majority of the priests, excluding of course a great number of homosexuals, live with their housekeepers contrary to the laws of the Ecumenical Councils. They select a young housekeeper when they become pastors and keep her for life. Where the priest goes, she goes. They sleep under the same roof, eat together and confide their troubles to each other. If we think anything amiss, would St. Jerome say, they dare to accuse us. Though St. Jerome says that their sole aim is to indulge in sexual intercourse; though the Ecumenical Councils (and the Holy Spirit) say that such conditions lead to adultery and excite the fires of passion; though we have the testimony of the Saints and 1500 years of historical evidence that the priests are living in sin; though every psychiatrist teaches that these unions cannot remain platonic if the priest is a normal man; though the files of the Chancery Offices contain thousands and ten thousands of sex scandals and complaints against the priests, yet Rome allows this condition to continue for purely political reasons. Rome rather has her clergy live in adultery than in marriage. A celibate priesthood can be ordered around and transferred from one place to another without the consent of wives and children. Salaries of celibates can be kept lower. Priests who break the laws of chastity are completely at the mercy of their bishop and can never revolt against their superior.

Scandals of priests are suppressed by all newspapers. The lives of modern popes are screened. Yet their immorality is as high as ever. In contrast to the Western priests who are generally immoral, restless, temperamental, intolerant, self-centered, inhuman, selfish, lazy, proud and dictatorial, the Roman Catholic clergy of the Eastern Rites, like the Greek Orthodox priests and Protestant ministers, are generally kind, understanding and active in their ministry. Roman celibacy is indirectly a blessing to Protestantism, because without it the Roman priest would be far more active in proselyting.

## CHAPTER NINETEEN

### THE GREEK ORTHODOX CHURCH

#### *WHAT IS THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN GREEK ORTHODOX BELIEF AND ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINES? WHO ARE THE UNIATS?*

As we have seen, the Church was founded in the East and spread to the West. If traditions were reliable we would find the same traditions in the East as in the West. This, however, is not the case. A large group of the Eastern church left the Orthodox body after the Western Reformation and accepted the bishop of Rome as the Head of the Church Universal. This Eastern group within the Roman Catholic Church is known as the "Eastern Rites" or Uniats. As the Uniats kept all their Eastern practices, their traditions also differ from those of the West.

"The Orthodox express their faith by the Creeds, the decisions of the first Seven Councils, and certain confessions of faith. They believe their communion to be the only true Church of Christ, reject the primacy and infallibility of the Pope, and teach that the Holy Ghost proceeds from God the Father alone. They believe in an objective Real Presence of our Lord in the Blessed Eucharist, but believe that the change takes place not at the words of consecration as we

do, but at the invocation of the Holy Ghost (Epiklesis), which follow them in the Mass. They deny Purgatory in the sense of a cleansing fire, while praying for the dead. They deny the Immaculate Conception, especially since its definition by the Pope. The Orthodox always baptize by immersion, administer Confirmation immediately after Baptism, give Communion under both kinds...hear confessions on rare occasions, anoint both the sick and the well, allow divorce in case of adultery, ordain by laying on one hand only, etc." (*Father Conway, Question Box*, p. 108). "They have no confessionals...Penance (metanoia) is administered rarely" (C.E. 4, 320). "It is a mistake... to speak of any Eastern liturgy as a Mass" (C.E. 9, 792). "They have no tradition of reverence for the reserved Eucharist" (C.E. 4, 320). "The Uniats sometimes copy the Latin multitude of altars in one church" (C.E. 4, 316). "Among the Greek Uniats the rosary is but little used by the laity" (C.E. 13, 188). "There are no statues" (Attwater, p. xv).

These few quotations from Roman Catholic textbooks scratch only the surface of the differences between East and West. They do not believe in clerical celibacy; they do not believe in the transubstantiation power of the priest; they do not believe that the priest has the power to forgive sins; they do not believe in indulgences, novenas, scapulars, stations of the cross, Sacred Heart worship, Holy Years, Sabbatine privileges, First Fridays, privileged altars, or anything invented after 1054. They have no Breviaries, no Missals, no daily Masses, no Low Masses, no acolytes, no altar-boys, no side-altars, no daily communions, no Mass stipends or sale of Mass intentions, no eucharistic processions, no *Tantum Ergo* nor *O Salutaris Hostia* hymns, no Benedictions of the Blessed Sacrament, no Latin liturgy, no Hail Marys, no Sacristies, no church organs, nor any other late medieval 'tradition' of the West. They do not use the Apostles' Creed

and even the Uniats refuse to add the "filioque" to the Nicene Creed.

The things they have in common with the West are usually common only in name or common with Protestant denominations. They consider Baptism by pouring so invalid that all Latin converts must be rebaptized. They have no Sacrament of adult Confirmation, while their rite of Chrism follows immediately after Baptism by immersion, and is not performed by the bishop, but by the pastor. Western theologians call the Eastern 'Confirmation' invalid. The name "Extreme Unction" is heretical in the East, because they do not anoint the dying. They anoint the sick with oil blessed by the priest, which the West calls invalid. They have no Penance, but Repentance (*metanoia*). Their forgiveness of sins does not require priestly powers or fixed penances. They have no round Hosts, nor use monstrances to expose their altar bread. They follow the Julian Calendar instead of the Gregorian Calendar which is used by Westerners, Catholic and Protestant alike. They celebrate New Year on September 1st. They do not even share the date of Easter with the Roman church, while Protestants do. While Roman scholars "boast" of the changes Rome has made, the Eastern Church boasts that it has never changed. Yet both churches used to be one and shared the same "traditions" which allegedly were handed down orally from the mouth of Christ to the successors of the apostles.

Except for a few individual Uniats in the United States who are trying to please the Pope for obvious reasons, the majority of Roman Catholics of the Eastern Rites have remained faithful to Eastern "traditions". Yet Rome maintains that they are one hundred percent members of the only true church. The Uniats are not bound by Canon Law, even if they were born 7,000 miles 'West' of Rome. If the ancestors of an American born priest came originally from Western

Europe, he is forbidden to marry; if they came from Eastern Europe, he is allowed to be married. If Rome really believed that Eucharistic worship, Rosaries, Hail Marys, Statues, etc. were beneficial to her members, she would have to enforce these traditions in the Eastern Rites also. The main income of the Western priest is derived from praying souls out of the flames of Purgatory, a practice which is foreign to the Eastern priests. Yet Rome dares to speak of "unity" within her church, and ridicules Protestant diversity. A mixed marriage between two Roman Catholics of different Rites (and there are many of them in the Eastern United States between Italians and Greeks) is more complicated than a mixed marriage between a Western Catholic and a Western Protestant. When the Greek Catholic tells the Italian Catholic that his priest is married, that the church services are in Greek, that he has been baptized by immersion, that he receives wine in communion and that he fasts on Wednesdays, 99 times out of 100 the Italian Catholic will not believe that the two belong to the same and only true church. There is no general Canon Law to determine in which tradition the children of such a mixed marriage are to be reared. Are they allowed to eat meat on Wednesdays like their Italian father, or must they fast like their Greek mother? What sort of baptism are they to patronize? May they be confirmed invalidly like the Easterners? Will the Westerner feel at home in an Eastern church without statues, stations, organs, Latin, Benedictions, etc. The answer to these questions seems to be or to point out that Rome does not care what one believes or what traditions one follows as long as one recognizes the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Universal Church. As long as the Uniat does not openly and publicly attack Western customs, he may keep all the practices of the Greek Orthodox Church.



## CHAPTER TWENTY

### ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT

#### *WHAT IS THE NEW ECUMENICAL MOVEMENT?*

Schism refers to ecclesiastical government, Heresy to ecclesiastical doctrine. The Greek Orthodox Christians, according to Roman theology, are no longer Schismatics but Heretics, because Rome has made Purgatory, Papal Infallibility, Immaculate Conception, etc., dogmas of faith. When attacking Protestantism or the beliefs of the Greek Orthodox Church, Roman theologians make it plain that both groups reject the same Roman Catholic dogmas: "The modern Orthodox Church denies Purgatory . . . rejects the Papal Infallibility, and the Papal Supremacy, the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, (etc.);" (*C.E.* 12, 576; 6, 753). But when the Vatican has in mind a possible merger of East and West, and dreams of imposing her papal tax system on the entire world, all Roman dogmas are at once minimized as just Latin customs of little importance: "Celibacy, azyme bread, and so on, are Latin Customs that no one thinks of forcing on them. They need not add the 'filioque' to the Creed; they will always keep their venerable rite untouched. Not a bishop

need be moved, hardly a feast (except that of St. Photius on 6 Feb.) altered. All that is asked of them is to come back. . . There is not really *any* question of doctrine involved. It is not heresy, but a schism" (*C.E.* 13, 538). On Aug. 6, 1955 the Associated Press quoted the pope as saying: "In reality the people of the East have nothing to fear from a reunion with the Roman Church. . . Absolutely nothing would be taken away from the divinity and splendor of their holy rites, nor from the sacred heritage given them by their Fathers" (*Vatican City, AP*, 8-6-55).

If this policy does not prove that the Vatican Hierarchy is a purely political system without principles of any kind, then no written confession is evidence of anything. The Roman Inquisition murdered thousands of 'heretics' for believing and following the sacred heritage of their Fathers. What constitutes heresy in the West seems to be quite permissible in the East, if willing to pay the Peter's pence.

The early Church of Rome abided by the Ecumenical Councils, taught that they were guided by the Holy Spirit, and excommunicated those who believed or acted contrary to their canons. The Roman Synod of 649, for example, anathematized all who did not reject the heretics anathematized by the five Universal Councils (*Lateran Council*, 649, canon 18; *Denzinger*, No. 271; *Kidd*, vol. 3, p. 50). Every one of the Seven Ecumenical Councils (A.D. 325, 381, 431, 451, 553, 680, 787) have been signed and approved by the early bishops of Rome.

The Eastern churches have always been ready and are still willing to merge with the West, if the new Church Universal is willing to abide by the decisions of the Seven Ecumenical Councils. The Jesuits cannot sincerely agree to this condition, because the early councils deny papal supremacy, papal infallibility, celibacy, and everything that contributed to the rise of the Roman papacy. As the Greek Orthodox Church

has never agreed to settle for less, the Catholic Encyclopedia (1907) believes that there is "no present likelihood of the pope's assenting to this basis" (*C.E.* 15, 147). In other words, Rome rejects the "traditions" of the first thousand years of Christianity, even those which allegedly carried the *imprimatur* of the Holy Ghost. Consequently, when the Council of Trent decreed that the traditions of men are of equal authority to the Word of God, it merely referred to the traditions of the very late Middle Ages.

Protestants sometimes wonder at what price Rome would merge with Protestantism. Many believe that the hundreds of anathemas of the Council of Trent make merger impossible. This is not true. If a very large Protestant group in a body would be willing to accept the Bishop of Rome as Head of the Church Universal; there is every reason to believe that Rome will allow them to keep all their Protestant practices. Like the Uniats from the Eastern Church, the Protestants would have to promise not to attack Roman doctrine. Thus, future Protestant generations, once they have adopted the name of "Catholics" and have become ignorant of the doctrinal issues involved, will become easy victims of their adopted 'pope' and will gradually embrace his medieval doctrines. Once the Protestants, who do not abide by the canons of the Ecumenical Councils, have merged with Rome, the Communist-dominated Eastern Church would have to accept the same conditions if it wished to survive.

For many years the Jesuits have been working towards a merger of all Christian groups and have their eyes on some ecumenical movements among Protestants. Some Catholic publications, without formal approval of Rome, have already begun to soften Roman Catholic condemnation of Protestant doctrine and practices. "It is a fact even today that Protestantism is not so much a Christian heresy as it is a schism in the Latin rite" (*The Priest*, May 1956). For

political reasons, the 'infallible' anathemas of Trent are temporarily ignored.

Pope John XXIII, immediately after his election in 1958, began to make preparations for an Ecumenical Council which is to encourage unity and merger with the Church of Rome. The Eastern Church in Europe is now considered more likely to make concessions to Rome because it is in greater danger of extinction by the Communists than it was in the Middle Ages by the Turks.

Ecumenicalism is not biblical, but man-made. It originated in the 4th century and died in the 11th century. As there is no Ecumenical Church today, it cannot hold an Ecumenical Council. The Council proposed for 1961 must be termed a General Council of the Roman Church. Like all general councils of this medieval church, it will be more political than religious. The individual Christian will have nothing to gain by it, but is merely discussed as a subject. Characteristics of the General Councils of the Middle Ages are not Christian at all. The canons of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) were drawn up before the council by the pope himself, and the bishops merely signed under duress. The Council of Lyons (1274) was a political council which failed to effect a merger between East and West, though the secular ambassadors of a secular Eastern Emperor signed a vaguely worded Creed in order to obtain Western aid against the invading Turks. The Council of Florence (1439) sought merger of East and West, but not in a Christian manner. Rome bribed an Eastern prelate, Bessarion, promised him the rich Western cardinalate, and used him to trick his colleagues into signing a merger. The Eastern prelates were furious, and the language used among these Eastern and Western prelates cannot be printed.

The Vatican Council (1870) was prepared by months of secret sessions and continued in session until the majority

of bishops (the great Hefele included) finally surrendered under the pressure and abuse of the organized few. Such councils have no higher motive than the assembly of the Mafia at Appalachin, N.Y., which discussed its penal system, proper jurisdiction and rights to the spoils.

The political maneuvering of Roman councils is so perfected that American political conventions are mere child's play by comparison. Some of the outstanding tricks are: (1) secret preparations for the councils, (2) rounding up of all yes-men who in a concerted and vociferous manner are to influence all others and to discourage all opposition, (3) keeping the agenda of the council secret, so that only a selected few can study the subject in advance, (4) use of a language unfamiliar to the opposition, (5) secrecy about and delay in publishing the genuine text.

It would seem that the so-called Ecumenical Council of Pope John XXIII will not be any more sincere than any previous Roman Council. No date has been set, no invitations have been announced, and the agenda, instead of being drafted by those who attend, is secretly prepared before the meeting. An NCWC news release about this council, written by Father James I. Tucek and date-lined "Vatican City", states: "His Holiness Pope John XXIII himself has indicated that there will be at least two years of preparation for the council, and no one can yet say with certainty what the council's agenda will be" (*Providence Visitor*, Feb. 26, 1959).

The language of the council has always favored those versed in that language. No Roman bishop and very few Western bishops attended the Seven Ecumenical Councils because they were not versed in the Greek language. They did not dare to protest publicly against the use of the Greek language because every student of the Bible is 'supposed' to know that language. In the Vatican Council of 1870 very few bishops and scholars were able to publicly air their

opinions because the majority was unable to converse or to debate in Latin, while a priest is 'supposed' to know Latin. Except for a few professors of the international universities of Rome, Innsbruck, Louvain and Friburg, who have years of experience in speaking Latin, and a few bishops accustomed to speaking before international groups, the average bishop will be unable to speak in Latin, while many of non-Latin extraction will be unable to understand the spoken Latin. Greek Orthodox and Protestant scholars, though they may be able to read Latin, are totally handicapped in a Latin Council. Unless an Ecumenical Council provides for interpreters and is governed by democratic rules, similar to those used by the United Nations, the decisions will be controlled by the few who do not necessarily represent the whole. Greek Orthodox and Protestant alike should be prepared to cope with new Cardinal Bessarions and Newmans whom the new council will undoubtedly create. The words "orthodox" and "protestant" imply that Romanism is a departure from evangelical Christianity, a corruption of the faith once delivered to the saints. Why should the guilty and the criminal lay down the rules under which he will tolerate merger with the righteous and the just?

## INDEX

### A

Abbo of Fleury, Saint, 111  
 Abbots, 124  
 Abelard, Peter, 29, 119, 132  
 Abstinence from meat, 10, 56, 105, 106, 118  
 Acolytes, 139  
 Acta Sanctorum, 109  
 Acts of Sylvester, 75  
 Adam, Prof. Karl, 26  
 Adoration of the Host, 139, 141  
 Adrian I, Pope, 76, 86  
 Adrian IV, Pope, 63, 97  
 Adultery, 118  
 Advent, 105, 106  
 Aelred, Saint, 132  
 African church, 125  
 African councils, 54, 73, 91, 92, 93, 100, 101  
 Agape, 27  
 Agapitus, Pope, 123  
 Agatha, Saint, 113  
 Agatho, Pope, 18, 101  
 Agnes, Saint, 113  
 Alexander III, Pope, 29, 116  
 Alexander VI, Pope, 60, 65, 103, 133  
 Alexander of Hales, 39  
 Alfred, Saint, 29  
 Altar, 139  
 Altar boys, 139  
 Altar bread, 27, 142  
 Alzog, Prof. John, 65  
 Ambrose, Saint, 35, 82, 84, 114, 119  
 Anacletus, Pope, 114  
 Anastasius I, Pope, 123  
 Anastasius II, Pope, 114, 123

Anastasius, Papal librarian, 59  
 Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, 119  
 Ann, Saint, 113  
 Anointing of the sick, 139, 140  
 Anselm, Archbishop of Canterbury, 88, 113, 115  
 Anselm, Bishop of Lucca, 87  
 Antichrist, 23, 57-66  
 Antioch, Church of, 12, 89, 90  
 Antoninus, Saint, 107  
 Apocrypha, 49-54  
 Apostles' Creed, 139  
 Apostolic Canons, 35, 121  
 Apostolic Constitutions, 35, 121  
 Apostolicus, 96, 130  
 Arianism, 20, 21, 34, 68  
 Armenian Church, 125  
 Assumption of Mary, 10, 30, 31, 33  
 Athanasius, Saint, 81, 82, 84, 122  
 Augustine, Saint, 33, 52, 53, 83, 84, 100, 101, 114  
 Augustine, Rule of, 33  
 Auricular confession, 27  
 Aventinus, 96

### B

Bafana, 113  
 Balsamon, Patriarch Theodore, 33, 34  
 Baptism, 28, 29  
 Baptism, Adult, 26, 27  
 Baptism, Infant, 26, 27, 28  
 Baptism by immersion, 27, 139, 140  
 Baptism by pouring, 140  
 Baronius, Cardinal, 22, 37, 58, 60  
 Bartholomew of Lucca, 59  
 Basle, Council of, 30, 103  
 Basil, Saint, 58

- Beatification, 115, 116  
 Bede, Saint, 85, 115  
 Benedict VI, Pope, 62  
 Benedict IX, Pope, 62, 99, 127, 128  
 Benedict XIII, Pope, 136  
 Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, 139  
 Berengarius, 112  
 Bible, 12, 40-45, 49, 55  
 Bible, Canon of, 50  
 Bible, *see also* Vulgate; *see also* Private interpretation  
 Bishop of bishops, 91  
 "Blessed", 115  
 Bohemia, Church of, 41, 132  
 Bonaventure, Saint, 38  
 Boniface I, Pope, 123  
 Boniface VII, Pope, 62  
 Boniface VIII, Pope, 63, 77, 103  
 Boniface, Saint, 41  
 Bonizo, Bishop, 128  
 Breviaries, 139  
 Bridget, Saint of Sweden, 64  
 Brigid, Saint of Ireland, 113  
 Britain, *see* England  
 Bruno, Bishop, 128  
 Bruno, Saint, 48, 88, 113  
 Burchard, Bishop John, 60, 133  
 Cajetan, Cardinal, 51  
 Callistus I, Pope, 58, 101  
 Callistus III, Pope, 65, 132  
 Camelaucum, 75, 77  
 Candles, 27  
 Canonization of Saints, 19, 29, 109-116  
 Canon law, 140  
 Cardinals, 9  
 Carthage, Council of 419, 53, 73, 92, 93, 122  
 Catechism, 107  
 Catechumenate, 26, 27  
 Catherine, Saint, 64, 113  
 "Catholic", 9, 67, 68, 69  
 "Catholic Church", 9, 15, 68, 70  
 "Catholic priest", 10  
 Cecilia, Saint, 113  
 Celestine, Pope, 54, 93  
 Celibacy of the clergy, 10, 27, 28, 53, 55, 56, 60, 117-137, 139, 141, 142, 143  
 Chair of Peter, 84, 89, 113  
 Chains of St. Peter, 133  
 Chalcedon, *see* Ecumenical Council, Fourth  
 Charlemagne, Emperor, 22, 41, 76, 94, 126  
 Chastity, Vow of, 117  
 Chrism, 140  
 Christmas, 113  
 Christopher, Saint, 113  
 "Church", 9, 67, 80  
 Church organ, 139  
 Chrysostom, Saint John, 82, 84, 92, 121  
 Clement of Rome, *called* Pope, 14, 32, 35, 119, 121  
 Clement II, Pope, 128  
 Clement of Alexandria, 118, 119  
 Clementine forgeries, 13, 31, 32, 37  
 Clermont, Council of, 131  
 Cletus, Pope, 114  
 Codex Vaticanus, 50  
 Commandments of the church, 105-108  
 Communion, 29, 139  
 Concubines, 121, 122  
 Confession of sin, 139  
 Confirmation, 139, 140  
 Constance, Council of, 30, 65, 102  
 Constantine, Emperor, 14, 68, 112  
 Constantinople, Patriarch of, 21, 22  
 Constitution of Sylvester, 37, 75  
 Cornelius, Pope, 69  
 Corinth, Church of, 13  
 Cup, Withholding of, 27, 28, 30, 102, 139  
 Cyprian, Saint, 17, 27, 32, 49, 71, 91, 92, 119  
 Cyriac, Patriarch, 23, 94



## D

Daily Communion, 139  
 Deacons, Seven, 36  
 Deusdedit, Pope, 123  
 "Dictatus Papae", 17, 87, 95  
 Dionysius the Areopagite, 32  
 Divorce, 139  
 Dollinger, Johann von, 104  
 Dominic, Saint, 34  
 Donation of Constantine, 19, 36, 76, 87  
 Double Monasteries, 126  
 Duchesne, Monsignor, 37, 47, 48, 58, 127  
 Duns Scotus, John, 39

## E

Easter, 140  
 Ecumenical Church, 14, 15, 16, 19, 22, 58, 68, 94  
 Ecumenical Council,  
   First, 33, 68, 120  
   Fourth, 18, 122  
   Fifth, 101  
   Sixth, 101  
   Seventh, 85, 86, 126  
 Ecumenical councils, 15, 16, 18, 30, 33, 69, 92, 99, 100, 104, 138, 143, 146  
 Ecumenicalism, 5, 94, 95, 145  
 Ecumenical movement, 142-147  
 Einhard, 110  
 Elvira, Council of, 119, 120  
 Emberdays, 105, 106  
 England, Church of, 24, 29, 95, 97, 116, 132  
 Epiklesis, 139  
 "Epistle of Peter to Pepin", 76  
 Eskil, Archbishop, 132  
 Eucharistic processions, 139  
 Eugene IV, Pope, 103  
 Europe, Western, 20  
 Eusebius, 50, 118, 119  
 Extreme Unction, 9, 140

## F

"Faith alone", 46-48  
 False Decretals, 37  
 Fasting, 105, 106  
 Felix II, Pope, 114  
 Felix III, Pope, 37, 123  
 Felix IV, Pope, 123  
 "Filioque", 138, 140, 142  
 First Fridays, 139  
 Florence, Council of, 145  
 Forgeries, 31-39, 75, 76  
 Fortunatus, Saint, 48  
 Frankfurt, Council of, 110  
 Frederick I, Emperor, 62, 63  
 Frederick II, Emperor, 63  
 Fulbert, Saint, 112

## G

Gangra, Council of, 121  
 Gaul, Church of, 21, 93  
 Gelasius I, Pope, 28, 33, 85  
 German Ritual, 41  
 Germany, Conversion of, 41  
 Greek Orthodox Church, 15, 88, 138-141, 142, 143, 144  
 Greek Rites, 142  
 Gregory I, Pope, 16-22, 28, 51, 58, 85, 94, 124  
 Gregory II, Pope, 28  
 Gregory III, Pope, 28  
 Gregory VII, Pope, 72, 87, 95, 96, 102, 129, 130  
 Gregory X, Pope, 132  
 Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, 122  
 Gregory Nazianzen, 122  
 Guido, Archbishop of Milan, 129

## H

Hail Marys, 10, 141  
 Hefele, Bishop Joseph, 34, 104, 121, 122  
 Henry IV, King, 96  
 Henry VIII, King, 134  
 Henry, Bishop of Louvain, 132  
 Heresy, 142, 143, 144  
 Heribert, Saint, 129

Hierarchy, 9  
 Hilary, Bishop of Arles, 73, 93, 123  
 Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, 48  
 Hildebrand *see* Gregory VII, Pope  
 Hippolytus, Saint, 58, 114  
 Holy City, 14  
 Holy Lance, 34  
 Holy Water, 10, 27  
 Holy Years, 139  
 Homosexuals, 137  
 Honorius, Pope, 18, 58, 101  
 Hormisdas, Pope, 123  
 Hosius, Bishop, 14, 68, 120  
 Housekeepers of priests, 120, 124, 126, 131, 136, 137  
 Hugo of St. Victor, 38, 39, 51  
 Hungary, Church of, 95  
 Hus, John, 102

## I

Ignatius, Saint, 28, 89, 90  
 Ignatius of Loyola, 47  
 Immaculate Conception of Mary, 10, 29, 30, 31, 139, 142  
 Impeccability, 100  
 Incense, 27  
 Index of forbidden books, 42, 43, 44  
 Indulgences, 9, 15, 19, 27, 31, 139  
 Infallibility of the Pope, 19, 99–104, 138, 142, 143  
 Innocent III, Pope, 29, 41, 88, 97, 98, 104, 105  
 Innocent VIII, Pope, 65, 133  
 Inquisition, 42, 143  
 Investiture, 19  
 Ireland, Church of, 97, 106, 113  
 Irenaeus, Saint, 57  
 Isidore, Saint, 21  
 Italy, 10  
 Italian Saints, 115  
 Ives, Saint, 96–97

## J

James, the Bishop, 10, 11, 12, 36, 89, 119

January, Saint, 113  
 Jerome, Saint, 50–51, 54, 82, 83, 114, 119, 122  
 Jerusalem, Church of, 10, 11, 12, 13, 89  
 Jesuits, 106  
 Joachim, Saint, 112  
 John VI, Pope, 125  
 John VII, Pope, 125  
 John X, Pope, 60  
 John XI, Pope, 61, 123  
 John XII, Pope, 61, 101, 102  
 John XIII, Pope, 123  
 John XV, Pope, 29, 61, 111, 123  
 John XXII, Pope, 63–64, 77, 103  
 John XXIII, Pope (1409–1415), 65, 102, 132  
 John XXIII, Pope (1958–), 145, 146  
 John, King of England, 97  
 John, Patriarch, 23  
 Josephus, 50  
 Jubilee Year of 1500, 133  
 Judas Maccabee, 50  
 Jude, Saint, 119  
 Judgment, Last, 110  
 Julian Calendar, 140  
 Julius II, Pope, 65, 77, 133  
 Julius III, Pope, 66  
 Justinian I, Emperor, 20, 124  
 Justinian II, Emperor, 125

## K

Kenrick, Archbishop Peter, 104  
 Kissing of pope's feet, 78, 87  
 Kokkinakis, Bishop Athenagoras, 88

## L

Lanfranc, Saint, 73, 115  
 Laodicea, Council of, 50  
 Lateran Council, Fourth, 98, 131, 145  
 Lateran councils, 131  
 "Lateinos", 57

Latin language, 41, 141, 147  
 Lent, 105, 106  
 Leo I, Pope, 18, 28, 48, 84-85, 93, 122, 123  
 Leo III, Pope, 76, 94  
 Leo IV, Pope, 29, 59  
 Leo IX, Pope, 19, 36, 62, 76, 77, 87, 95, 128  
 Leo X, Pope, 133  
 Liber Pontificalis, 35, 37  
 Liberius, Pope, 34, 101, 114  
 Limbo, 53  
 Litany of All Saints, 114  
 Liutprand, Bishop, 61  
 Lombards, 21, 75, 76  
 Longinus, Saint, 34, 113  
 Low Masses, 139  
 Lower clergy, 135  
 Lucy, Saint, 113  
 Luther, Martin, 43, 44, 47, 49, 51, 52, 134  
 Lyons, Council of, 145

## M

Maccabub, Books of, 49, 50, 52  
 Malachy, Saint, 113  
 Mariolatry, 55  
 Marion Scott, 59, 129  
 Marinus I, Pope, 123  
 Martin V, Pope, 102  
 Martin the Pole, 59  
 Mary to crush Serpent, 48  
 Mass, 9, 15, 29, 31, 43, 137  
 Mass Intentions, 139  
 Mass-priests, 131  
 Mass stipends, 139  
 Mathilda, Countess, 129, 130  
 Medals, Blessed, 10  
 Melito, Saint, 50  
 Michael, Archbishop, 88  
 Michael, Saint, 56, 114  
 Milan, Church of, 68, 95, 129  
 Missals, 139  
 Miter, 77  
 Mithraism, 72

Mixed Marriages, 107, 141  
 Monasteries, 28  
 Monks and nuns, 124  
 Monsignors, 9  
 Monstrance, 140  
 Monte Cassino, 125, 129  
 Mother Church, 11, 14, 95

## N

Neo-Caesarea, Council of, 28, 121  
 New Year, 140  
 Newman, Cardinal, 27  
 Nice, *see* Ecumenical council  
 Nicene Creed, 68  
 Nicolaus, Saint, 113  
 Novenas, 10, 27

## O

O Salutaris Hostia, 139  
 Oath, Sacrament of, 28  
 Oath of fealty, 95, 96, 97  
 Oath, *see also* vows  
 Origen of Alexandria, 49, 50, 81  
 Original Sin, 26  
 Oxford, Council of, 42, 43

## P

Papacy, 9, 15, 16, 17, 19, 23, 30, 94, 95  
 Papal Bulls, 17, 34  
 Papal States, 22, 75, 76  
 Papal successions, 103  
 Papal taxes, 19  
 Paschasius Radbertus, 86  
 Pastor, Ludwig von, 65  
 Patrick, Saint, 110, 113, 114, 123  
 Paul, the Apostle, 13, 36, 79, 80, 90, 91  
 Paul III, Pope, 65, 133  
 Paul V, Pope, 104  
 Pelagian heresy, 26  
 Pelagius, Pope, 18  
 Penance, Sacrament of, 9, 28, 29, 139, 140  
 Pepin, King, 75, 76

Perpetua, Saint, 118  
 Peter, the Apostle, 12, 13, 31, 33,  
 36, 78, 79, 89, 90, 118  
 Peter Damian, Saint, 129  
 Peter de Vinea, 63  
 Peter of Blois, 88  
 Peter of Poitiers, 39  
 Peterspence, 19, 97, 143  
 Petrine text, 79-88, 90  
 Petronilla, Saint, 119  
 Philip I, King of France, 96  
 Philip II, King of France, 97  
 Philip, the Evangelist, 119  
 Photius, Saint, 112, 143  
 Pius V, Pope, 116  
 Pius VII, Pope, 136  
 Pius IX, Pope, 30, 44  
 Pius XII, Pope, 30  
 Platonic marriage, 120  
 Pontiff, 20, 28, 72, 73  
     *see also* Supreme Pontiff  
 "Pope" (papa), 9, 11, 17, 71, 72,  
 88, 95  
 Popes, Immorality of, 58, 60, 61,  
 65  
 Popess Joan, 59, 127  
 Presbyters, 131  
 Priests, Illegitimate sons of, 134,  
 135  
 Primacy, 17, 31, 32, 33, 34, 36, 53,  
 54, 88, 89-98, 138, 143  
 Printing Press, 43  
 Private interpretation of the Bible,  
 18, 44, 45, 94  
 Processions, 27  
 Protestantism, 15, 144  
 Pseudo-Isidore, 37  
 Public Penance, 27, 53  
 Purgatory, 9, 16, 23, 49, 50, 98,  
 139, 141, 142

Q

Quinisext Council (in Trullo), 105,  
 124, 125

R

Rabanus Maurus, 86  
 Real Presence, 138  
 Relics, Miraculous, 34  
 Remission of sin, 53, 139, 140  
 Repentance, 140  
 Rheims, Church of, 95  
 Rheims, Council of, 61, 12  
 Richelieu, Cardinal, 136  
 Ring, Papal, 77  
 "Rock" (Petra), 17, 33, 78-88, 104  
 "Roman", 9, 67  
 "Roman Catholic Church", 15, 68,  
 69  
 "Roman Church", 9, 11, 12, 13, 14,  
 16, 26, 33, 40, 41, 58, 67, 68, 69,  
 70, 87, 89, 97, 125  
 Roman Councils, 19  
 Roman Ritual, 19, 20, 110, 111,  
 116  
 Romish, 69  
 Rosaries, 10, 27, 34, 141, 139  
 Rule of St. Francis, 106

S

Sabbatine Privilege, 34, 139  
 Sacraments, 38, 39, 97, 127  
 Sacred Heart worship, 139  
 Sacrifices for sin, 10  
 "Saint", 115  
 Santa Claus, 113  
 Santa Scala, 34  
 Scandals of the clergy, 137  
 Scapulars, 10, 27, 34  
 Schism, 142, 143, 144  
 Schism, First (867), 22, 95, 127  
 Schism, Final (1054), 22, 95, 128  
 Schism Western (1378-1414), 64,  
 65, 103  
 Septuagint, 50, 51, 52  
 Sergius, Pope, 61, 123  
 Seven Sacraments, 9, 15, 29, 31,  
 35, 98, 112  
 Side-altars, 139  
 Siegfried, Archbishop, 130

Sigbert of Gemblours, 59  
 Silverius, Pope, 123  
 Siricius, Pope, 28, 122  
 "Six Hundred Sixty-Six", 19, 57, 62, 87  
 Sixtus IV, Pope, 65, 133  
 Sozomen, 40, 58  
 Spain, Church of, 92, 95  
 Stations of the Cross, 10, 27  
 Statue worship, 27, 55, 56, 59, 83, 109, 110, 139, 141  
 Stephen II, Pope, 114  
 Stephen III, Pope, 58, 75  
 Stephen V, Pope, 114  
 Stigmata of St. Francis, 113  
 Stock, Simon, 34  
 Stole, 77  
 Strossmayer, Bishop Joseph, 104  
 Subdeacons, 122  
 Summas, 38  
 Supreme Pontiff, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 36, 53, 72, 73, 74, 87, 88, 93, 94, 95, 116, 129, *see also* Pontiff  
 Sutri, Council of, 128  
 Sweden, Church of, 132  
 Syllabus of Errors, 44  
 Sylvester I, Pope, 37  
 Sylvester II, Pope, 36, 62, 76, 112  
 Syrian Church, *see* Antioch, Church of

## T

Talleyrand, Bishop, 136  
 Tantum Ergo, 139  
 Taragona, Council of, 42  
 Tarasius, Patriarch, 86  
 Temporal power of pope, 31, 75-78  
 Tertullian, Bishop, 27, 73  
 Thomas Aquinas, Saint, 29, 38, 51  
 Tiara, 19, 77  
 Tithes, 107  
 Tonsure, 27, 28  
 Toulouse, Council of, 42

Tours, Council of, 124  
 Tradition, 25-30, 35, 38, 138, 140, 144  
 Transubstantiation, 9  
 Transubstantiation powers, 139  
 Trent, Council of, 52, 107, 135  
 Trosly, Council of, 60, 87  
 Trullo, Council in, *see* Quinisext Council  
 Tyndale, William, 43

## U

Ulrich, Saint, 29, 111  
 Uniats, 139  
 "Universal Bishop", 23  
 Urban VII, Pope, 116  
 Urban VIII, Pope, 104

## V

Vatican Council (1870), 30, 104  
 "Venerable", 115  
 Veronica, Saint, 34, 113  
 Vestments, liturgical, 27  
 Vicarius Filii Dei, 19, 36, 62, 78, 87  
 Vigilius, Pope, 18, 101, 123  
 Vincent Ferrer, Saint, 64  
 Vows, 134  
 Vulgate Bible, 40, 42, 51

## W

"Whorehouse" of Rome, 127  
 William the Conqueror, 95  
 Winchester, Council of, 29  
 Worms, Council of, 96, 130  
 Wycliff, John, 42, 69, 70, 88, 102

## X

Ximenez, Cardinal, 51

## Z

Zephyrinus, Pope, 101  
 Zion, 80  
 Zosimus, Pope, 35, 53, 54, 92, 93, 100, 101

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(Latin collections of original sources may be found in one or another of the following American universities: Berkeley, Calif.; Urbana, Ill.; Chicago University; Newberry Library, Chicago; Madison, Wis.; Iowa City; Minneapolis, Minn.; Philadelphia, Pa.; etc.)

ACTA SANCTORUM, ed. by John Bolland, S.J., d. 1665.  
Paris. 65 vols.

ADAM, CARL, b. 1876, *The Spirit of Catholicism*; New York, Macmillan, 1948.

ALZOG, REV. JOHN B., d. 1878, *Universal Church History*, Manual of; Cincinnati, Clarke, 1903. 3 vols.

ATTWATER, DONALD (Rom. Cath.), *Eastern Catholic Worship*; New York, 1945.

ANGLO-SAXON CHRONICLE, tr. by Benjamin Thorpe.  
London, 1861. 2 vols.

APOCRYPHA, *see* Bible, Catholic version.

AQUINAS, *see* Thomas Aquinas.

AVENTINUS, JOANNES, d. 1534, *Annales Boiorum*; Ingelstad, 1554.

BALTIMORE CATECHISM, No. 3; Buffalo, 1933.

BARONIUS, CESARE, d. 1607, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, ed. by Mansi; Toulouse, 1869; extended from 28 to 38 volumes.

BIBLE, Douay version, translated from the Latin Vulgate; London, B. Herder, 1912.

BRIDGET (Birgitta) OF SWEDEN, d. 1373, *Revelationes*; Nuremberg, 1500.

BREVIARIUM ROMANUM; Turin, 1930. 4 vols.

- BULLARIUM ROMANUM; Rome, 1733-1857; Turin, 1857-1885; extended to 51 vols.
- BURCHARD, BISHOP JOHN, d. 1506, *Diarium*; Paris, 1885. 3 vols.
- CATHERINE OF SIENNA, d. 1380, *Epistole*; Milan, 1842.
- CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA. New York, Appleton, 1907.
- CONWAY, REV. BERTRAND, *Question Box*; New York, 1929.
- DENZINGER, REV. HENRY, d. 1883, *Enchiridion Symbolorum, definitionum et declarationum*; Wurzburg, 1854; Freiburg, 1908; Barcelona, 1948; *Sources of Catholic Dogma*; London, Herder, 1957.
- DUCHESNE, MSGR. LOUIS, d. 1922.  
Christian Worship, its Origin and Evolution; London, 1912. Early History of the Christian Church; New York, Longmans, 1913. The Beginnings of the Temporal Sovereignty of the Popes; London, 1908.
- DUPUY, PIERRE, d. 1651, ed., *Preuves de l'Histoire du differend de Boniface et Philippes le Bel*; *bound with: Histoire du differend*; Paris, 1655.
- IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA, d. 1556, *Spiritual Exercises*; New York, P. J. Kenedy, 1914.
- JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS, d. 95, *The Work of*; New York, Leavitt (n.d.).
- KIDD, BERESFORD J., b. 1863, ed., *Documents illustrative of the History of the Church*; London, 1941. 3 vols.
- LABBE, PHILIP, *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio*; Venice, 1775. 29 vols.

**LIBER PONTIFICALIS**, ed. by Msgr. Louis Duchesne, d. 1922; Paris, 1892. 2 folio vols.

**LIVY, TITUS**, d. 17, History of Rome; New York, Dutton, 1926. 6 vols.

**MANSI, JOHN DOMINIC**, d. 1769, ed., *Sacrorum Conciliorum collectio*; Florence, Venice, 1758-1798; extended from 31 to 58 folio vols.

**MICHAEL, ARCHBISHOP**, *The Schism* (pamphlet).

**MIGNE, JACQUES PAUL**, d. 1875, ed., *Patrologiae Latinae cursus*, and *Patrologiae Graecae cursus*. 473 volumes (These volumes can be found in the New York City Public Library; Union Theological Seminary, N.Y.C.; Washington, D.C.; University of Chicago; Newberry Library, Chicago; Milwaukee, Wis.; and in the State universities of Philadelphia, Pa.; Urbana, Ill.; Madison, Wis.; Iowa City, Ia.; Minneapolis, Minn.; Lincoln, Neb.; USC and UCLA, Los Angeles, Calif.; Univ. at Berkeley, Calif.; etc. etc.).

**MIRBT, CARL TH.**, b. 1860, *Quellen zur geschichte des Papstthums und des romische Katholizismus*; Leipzig, 1895; Tübingen, 1934.

**MISSALE ROMANUM**; Regensburg, 1924.

**MONUMENTA GERMANIAE HISTORICA**, ed. by Pertz, Weiland, Doeberl, etc. *Scriptores Rerum Germanicarum*; Hannover, 1894, 42 vols. *Leges*; and other collections, totalling 127 vols.

**MURATORI, LOUIS A.**, d. 1750, ed. *Annali d'Italia*; Milan, 1744-1749; 12 folio vols. *Antiquitates Italiae Medii Aevi*; Milan, 1738-1742; 6 folio



vols. *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*; Milan, 1723-1751; 31 folio vols.

NEWMAN, CARDINAL JOHN H., d. 1890, *Development of Christian Doctrine, An essay on*; London, 1878; 6th ed., 1890; rev. ed., New York, Longmans, 1949.

PASTOR, LUDWIG VON, b. 1854, *History of the Popes*; London, 1908; St. Louis, 1906; 6 vols.; extended to 40 vols. London, 1953.

PETER DE VINEA, d. 1249, *Epistolae*, ed. by J. R. Iselius; Basel, 1740; 2 vols.

RYMER, THOMAS, d. 1713, ed., *Foedera, conventiones, litterae et . . . acta publica inter reges Angliae et alios*; 3rd ed. London, 1745. 40 vols.

THOMAS AQUINAS, d. 1274, *Summa Theologica* (English text); London, 1928. 22 vols.

## SECOND VOLUME

is scheduled for release in 1962 and will contain the history of the following subjects:

The Seven Sacraments; the Mass; Origin of its name; its sacrificial character; rituals; presbyters as Mass-priests; Parts of the Mass; Confiteor; Low Masses; Side-Altars; Priest facing people at the altar; Candles and Crucifixes on the altar; Elevation of the Host; Latin as the liturgical language of the Mass, Vestments of the Mass, Errors of the Missal; Mass Stipends; Transubstantiation; Origin of this doctrine; Corpus Christi; Eucharistic processions; Incense; Blood miracles; Withholding of the Cup; Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament; Tantum Ergo; Monstrances; Tabernacles; Altar lamps, Genuflections, Forty Hours Devotion; the Doctrine of Intention; Assumption of Mary; Immaculate Conception of Mary; the Rosary; Scapulars, Medals; Sacred Heart Devotion; First Fridays; Novenas; Stations of the Cross.



CPSIA information can be obtained  
at [www.ICGtesting.com](http://www.ICGtesting.com)  
Printed in the USA  
BVHW061141271218

536340BV00008B/371/P



9 781258 514310

